

*The Department of State*

ISSUED MONTHLY

MAY 5 - 1956

# bulletin

XXXIV, No. 869

February 20, 1956



**RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION  
LEGISLATION • *Message of the President to the Congress* . . . . . 275**

**UNITED STATES POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST •  
*Exchange of Correspondence between Secretary Dulles and  
Members of Congress* . . . . . 285**

**THE PRESENT SITUATION IN GERMANY • *by Under  
Secretary Hoover* . . . . . 290**

**POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON  
THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL  
COMMODITIES • *by William C. Armstrong* . . . . . 301**

**INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVEN-  
TION TRANSMITTED TO SENATE • *President's  
Transmittal Message, Report of Secretary of State, and Text  
of Convention* . . . . . 311**

**TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED MATTERS •  
*Report on Meeting of Inter-American Council of Jurists* . . . . . 296**

*For Index see inside back cover*



# *The Department of State* bulletin

VOL. XXXIV, No. 869 • PUBLICATION 6292

February 20, 1956

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25  
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Rec

To th

Th

land

chara

have

been

It is

under

The

and

uraliz

opera

have

tions

inter

and

mend

and

Th

tinct

polic

tional

of ha

strict

immig

porta

separ

distin

mend

be con

Th

was d

<sup>1</sup> H.

Feb. 8

<sup>2</sup> For

2, 1953

Febru

# Recommended Changes in Immigration Legislation

## MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS<sup>1</sup>

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Throughout our history immigration to this land has contributed greatly to the strength and character of our Republic. Over the years we have provided for such immigration because it has been to our own national interest that we do so. It is no less to our national interest that we do so under laws that operate equitably.

The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization have made a thorough study of the operation of our present immigration laws, and have advised me concerning the changes and additions which they consider necessary in the national interest. I have carefully reviewed their findings and concur in their conclusions. The recommendations now made are based on those findings and conclusions.

This Message takes up four separate and distinct subject matters respecting our immigration policies: (1) the quota system and the use of national origins, (2) the private-relief-bill system of handling hardship cases, (3) unnecessary restrictions and administrative provisions of our immigration laws, and (4) judicial review in deportation. Each such subject matter is treated separately because the problems in each are wholly distinct from the others. Accordingly, the recommendations as to each subject matter will, I hope, be considered separately and each on its own merit.

### I

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952<sup>2</sup> was developed essentially as a codification of many

<sup>1</sup> H. Doc. 329, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; transmitted on Feb. 8.

<sup>2</sup> For an article analyzing the act, see BULLETIN of Feb. 2, 1953, p. 195, and Feb. 9, 1953, p. 232.

separate, and sometimes overlapping and inconsistent, immigration and nationality laws. It was thought inappropriate, in connection with that legislation, to revise our basic immigration policies. Moreover, at that time 1950 census information was incomplete.

The time has now come to consider those policies. Experience in the post-war world demonstrates that the present national-origins method of admitting aliens needs to be re-examined, and a new system adopted which will admit aliens within allowable numbers according to new guidelines and standards.

The Congress has traditionally formulated our basic immigration policies, and will doubtless wish to make its decision as to what new system should be established only after its own study and investigation of all possible choices. There are many factors that must be taken into consideration. Among these are: the needs of this country for persons having specialized skills or cultural accomplishments; close family relationships; the populations and immigration policies of countries sending immigrants to this country; their past immigration and trade relationships with this country; and their assistance to the joint defense of the friendly free nations of the world.

Pending the completion by the Congress of such study and investigation, it is essential that we take interim measures to alleviate as much as possible inequities in the present quota system. Accordingly, I recommend the immediate enactment of the following proposals.

First, the present quota system sets a maximum annual authorization of 154,657 quota immigrants. This figure is derived from a formula based upon the 1920 population. I recommend that total population as shown by the 1950 census be used as the base for determining the overall ceiling. I

believe that economic growth over the past thirty years and present economic conditions justify an increase of approximately 65,000 in quota numbers. I recommend that Congress provide for such an increase by fixing the overall ceiling in terms of a percentage of total population as shown by the 1950 census. The new ceiling recommended would be approximately 220,000 quota numbers annually.

In order to eliminate some of the inequity resulting from the fact that several countries have large quotas which they do not use while others have small quotas which are usually oversubscribed, I recommend that the additional quota numbers—i.e. those over and above the 154,657 numbers now provided for—be distributed among countries in proportion to their actual immigration to this country since the establishment of the quota system in 1924.

This method of allocation will help to alleviate the problem of oversubscribed quotas. At the same time no country will have a lesser number of quota numbers allocated to it than at present.

Second, I recommend that the Congress set aside from the increased annual quota 5,000 numbers to be available for admission of aliens without regard to nationality or national origin. Use of these numbers would enable us to meet some of the needs of this country which develop from time to time for persons with special skills and cultural or technical qualifications.

The existing immigration law recognizes somewhat similar criteria for quota immigrants by giving a preference to those [""]whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability . . . and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.[""] Our needs and requirements should be determined on the basis of consultation among the various departments and agencies of the Government, and also with the advice and testimony of private organizations.

This special pool has further value as an experimental plan departing entirely from our present system of distributing quotas on a basis of nationality or place of birth. It also would enable us to give greater assistance to persons abroad who have undergone suffering and hardship resisting Communist aggression, who would make beneficial

contributions to this country, and who will not have the benefit of the Refugee Relief Act after that Act's termination.

Third, quota numbers that are unused by countries to which they are allocated should be made available for use elsewhere. Under our present law quota numbers which are unused by any particular country in the year in which they are available become void and may not be used by any other country.

I recommend enactment of legislation that will permit the utilization of unused quota numbers in the succeeding year. This should be done by pooling the unused quota numbers in each of the following areas: Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific ocean area. These pooled quota numbers would then be distributed during a twelve-month period on a first come, first served basis among eligible applicants of the area, without regard to country of birth within the area. These quotas should be limited to aliens who qualify for preference status under existing law—persons having special skills or close relatives in the United States.

There is a further inequity in the quota system by virtue of the so-called mortgage on quotas resulting from the issuance of visas under the Displaced Persons Act and other special acts. The law provides that visas issued under these acts are chargeable against quotas authorized under the Immigration Act. The result is that the quotas of many countries are mortgaged far into the future. For example, fifty percent of the quota for Greece is mortgaged until the year 2017; for Lithuania, until 2090; for Latvia, until 2274. The total number so mortgaged for the year 1955 amounted to about 8,000, and over the total span of years the aggregate could be as much as 328,000. I recommend the elimination of this unfairness. This is consistent with the action of the Congress in enacting the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Congress did not then impose additional mortgages on quotas but provided special non-quota visas for eligible refugees.

## II

For some time I have considered that undue and largely useless burdens are placed upon the Congress and the President by the avalanche in recent years of private bills for the relief of aliens. The number of these bills is strikingly high in comparison with the number of public enactments. In the First Session of the Eighty-Fourth Congress



private immigration enactments alone accounted for 413 of 880 enactments, public and private; 3,059 such bills were introduced. During the Eighty-Third Congress, private immigration enactments accounted for 753 of 1,788 enactments, both public and private; 4,797 such bills were introduced. At the beginning of the present Session, there were 2,159 private immigration measures pending.

The Congress, in the performance of its constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each private immigration bill introduced. The President, in the performance of his constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each bill enacted. The Nation's interest would surely be better served if the bulk of these private immigration claims were handled through suitable administrative machinery and if the Congress and the Executive could thus give their full attention to more urgent national problems.

Under the private-bill system of handling individual immigration cases, many persons fail to obtain the very relief which others have received, because Congress has not had the time to take up and act on the bills introduced for their benefit. Indeed there are many whose plight has not even come to the attention of the Congress.

For these reasons it is my belief that action is called for to provide the necessary administrative authority to take care of such cases. I hope that such action will be taken without delay so that it may be of help this year. The enactment of such authority, in my opinion, would substantially eliminate the need for private legislative redress in this area. I suggest that there should be vested in the Attorney General limited discretionary powers to grant relief with respect to admission and deportation of aliens. Such discretion should be limited to aliens with close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations, regardless of the technical statutory ground on which the alien is inadmissible or subject to deportation. These classes of cases embrace the great bulk of the hardship cases which appeal to our sense of fairness. However, no relief ought to be accorded aliens whose presence here would be dangerous to the safety and security of the United States. An appropriate charge against the applicable quota would be made in each case where relief is granted.

It should further be provided by the Congress that there shall be a ceiling on the number of cases in which such discretionary authority may be exercised.

### III

Experience under the existing immigration law has established that there are a number of changes, aside from the quota provisions, which should be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Some provisions create unnecessary restrictions upon travel to the United States, while others inflict great hardships upon the aliens affected. Consequently, I make the following recommendations:

Under the present law, every alien applying for a visa must be fingerprinted; and every alien admitted without a visa and remaining in the United States for thirty days or longer, even if here temporarily, must be fingerprinted. Although in our minds no stigma is attached to fingerprinting, it is not a requirement of travel in other countries. We should be the first to remove travel obstacles which hamper the free exchange of ideas, cultures and commerce. Further, experience over the last three years has shown that this requirement does not significantly contribute to our national safety and security. The law should be amended to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive the requirement of fingerprinting, on a reciprocal basis, for aliens coming here for temporary periods.

We must recognize the tremendous increase in air and surface travel in recent years. Aliens traveling from one country to another often find it necessary to pass through the United States without any intention to remain in or even visit this country. A South American flying to or returning from Europe, for example, will often pass through the United States. He should not be required to meet all of the standards for admission, coupled with inspection and examination, that normally apply. These requirements result in unnecessary hardships to the traveler, expense to the carrier, and loss of good will, without proportionate benefit to the United States. The law should be amended accordingly.

The present statute contains a restrictive requirement which makes it necessary for immigration authorities to inspect and apply all grounds of exclusion to aliens seeking admission to the mainland of the United States from Alaska and

Hawaii. This requirement results in expense to the Government and causes delays and inconvenience in travel. It must be remembered that, by definition in the law, these Territories are part of the United States, and aliens who have entered or are present in them are subject to all the provisions of the Act. If the alien was deportable before he came to the mainland, he remains deportable. I recommend the elimination from the law of this unnecessary restriction upon travel.

The immigration laws presently require aliens to specify race and ethnic classification in visa applications. These provisions are unnecessary and should be repealed.

A large group of refugees in this country obtained visas by the use of false identities in order to escape forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain; the number may run into the thousands. Under existing law such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation. The law should be amended to give relief to these unfortunate people.

The inequitable provisions relating to Asian spouses and adopted children should be repealed.

The Immigration Act grants special naturalization benefits to veterans of our Armed Forces who have completed at least three years' honorable service and who can submit proof of admission for permanent residence. Many have been unable to submit this proof. I recommend that proof of admission be not required in such cases.

The present statute is unnecessarily restrictive as to aliens who marry United States citizens. It forbids adjustment to permanent residence if the alien has been in the United States less than one year before the marriage. This disrupts the family and is expensive for the alien who must go abroad to obtain a nonquota visa, without proportionate benefit to the United States. I recommend that the requirement of one year's presence in the United States before marriage be repealed.

The above covers the principal changes which I recommend as a minimum toward amelioration of the immigration laws. Others will be suggested by the Attorney General.

#### IV

Just as the Nation's interests call for a larger degree of flexibility in the laws for regulating the flow of other peoples to our shores, there is at the same time a significant need to strengthen the laws established for the wholesome purpose of rid-

ding the country of the relatively few aliens who have demonstrated their unfitness to remain in our midst. Some of these persons have been found to be criminals of the lowest character, trafficking in murder, narcotics, and subversion. Constitutional due process wisely confers upon any alien, whatever the charge, the right to challenge in the courts the Government's finding of deportability. However, no alien who has once had his day in court, with full rights of appeal to the higher courts, should be permitted to block his removal and cause unnecessary expense to the Government by further judicial appeals the only purpose of which is delay. I am concerned by the growing frequency of such cases involving as they often do the depraved and confirmed criminal. Accordingly, I have asked the Attorney General to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal that will remedy this abuse of legal process.

I believe that these changes in our immigration and nationality laws, together with the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act which I have heretofore recommended to the Congress,<sup>3</sup> not only will advance our own self-interest, but also will serve as living demonstrations that we recognize our responsibilities of world leadership. I urge their careful consideration by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE  
February 8, 1956

### U.S. Chiefs of Mission in Asia To Meet at Tokyo

Press release 69 dated February 8

A conference of the U.S. Chiefs of Mission in the Far East will be held at Tokyo for 3 days beginning March 19. The purpose of the conference is to enable the principal U.S. diplomatic officials in the area to confer together on general aspects of Far Eastern policy and to discuss overall problems.

This conference is another in a series of regional meetings of U.S. Ambassadors which are held periodically in the various geographic areas of the world.

The Secretary of State plans to attend the open-

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, June 13, 1955, p. 951.

ing session of the conference following the meeting in Karachi of the SEATO Foreign Ministers.

The principal officers from the following U.S. posts will participate in the conference: Bangkok, Canberra, Djakarta, Hong Kong, Manila, Phnom Penh, Rangoon, Saigon, Singapore, Seoul, Taipei, Tokyo, Vientiane, and Wellington.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Walter S. Robertson, will act as chairman of the conference. Certain other U.S. Government agencies will be represented by observers.

## Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference

Press release 68 dated February 7

*Secretary Dulles:* I will be glad to answer any questions.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, there was a second letter received by the Government from Mr. Bulganin last week on the question of a friendship treaty. Are you working with the President now on a reply?*

A. Well, we haven't really gotten around to working on that. The urgency, I think, is not very great. The position of the United States was pretty fully set out in the letter which President Eisenhower wrote to Chairman Bulganin in answer to the first letter.<sup>1</sup> I think if you recall the history of what happened it would be illuminating. You see, the Soviet Government did not feel, apparently, that they could let their people hear of President Eisenhower's letter until they had some further information to cover it up with. So they held their own people in ignorance, I think for 6 days—it may have been 7 days—in complete ignorance of the fact that there had been any letter from President Eisenhower. All the rest of the world knew it; indeed, in the satellites they knew it. But in the Soviet Union nobody was allowed to know that there was such a reply, or that the reply had taken a negative view toward the Bulganin proposal. During that period they wrote another letter, which they published at the same time that they published the letter from President Eisenhower. So I think the second letter can be interpreted as being designed very largely for domestic consumption. The essence of it is already covered, I think, and dealt with by

President Eisenhower's letter. Nevertheless, we are giving it careful study to see if we can find in it anything which might possibly be useful. But we haven't dealt with it on an urgent basis.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, you do not preclude the possibility of an answer to this letter?*

A. Oh, no. There will, undoubtedly, be an answer.

*Q. Are you saying, sir, that you feel the point of diminishing returns has been reached in a public exchange of this kind—that there is no fruitful possibility in their going forward with this kind of exchange?*

A. Well, that isn't quite what I said. But I think it is a fact that this has gotten pretty much into a propaganda channel. The handling of the President's letter to Premier Bulganin and his reply, that is, the second letter, indicates that it is largely treated as a propaganda matter by the Soviet rulers. When these matters get essentially into the propaganda field, it is not as easy to make any progress as though there was a sincere desire to arrive at a result, which generally implies confidential exploratory contacts.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, when we were talking about the release by the Chinese of their version of the Geneva talks, you said that there had been no breach of faith on their part for they had told you in advance that they were going to make this release. Now when it comes to this latest exchange of notes, was something said at the time that the note was submitted to make it clear that they intended publication, that is, were we taking the initiative in making public what might otherwise have been a confidential exchange, or did we make public what they would make public if we didn't, and how do you know those things?*

A. Well, we had a discussion about this whole subject with the Soviet Ambassador here, Mr. Zaroubin, and we also drew certain inferences from the fact the Soviet had chosen the most spectacular possible way to make the first communication to the United States; namely, an unprecedented demand that the Soviet Ambassador should personally see the President, and that was publicized. That very initial act threw around the whole operation a glamour of publicity, which, obviously, must have been intended.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, it was reported from Bonn*

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 6, 1956, p. 191.

yesterday that the German Government would refuse continuation of financial contributions. Now, according to the reports, a spokesman for the Finance Ministry said that the request was unfounded and a threat against Bonn's balanced budget. I was wondering whether you could give us your views on this?

A. There are conversations that took place. In the first place, as I recall, it was when I was in Paris at the NATO meeting last December, with reference to the contribution by the Federal Republic of Germany to the maintenance within Germany of certain of the NATO forces that are provided by the United States, the United Kingdom, and by France. The talks at that time did not come to any positive conclusion. They were held rather hurriedly, and they are being continued at the present time. There is a problem which is due to the fact that the maintenance of the forces I mentioned in Germany entails certain costs, particularly in terms of local currency, and that is a considerable burden, of course, on the countries who maintain their troops there—particularly those who are getting short of external currency, notably the United Kingdom. The question has been raised whether, in view of the fact that the defense costs of the Germans themselves have not gone up as rapidly as was expected because of the lag—slippage—in the timetable of their forces, it would be within the spirit of the North Atlantic Treaty that consideration should be given to a further contribution by the Germans to the foreign exchange costs of those who are maintaining troops within Germany. That matter is being discussed. I do not think there has been any final conclusion reached.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, are you saying that there is nothing new in this second Bulganin letter?*

A. No. I said that in the main it would seem that its points were covered already by the President's reply to the first letter. But I said we were examining it carefully to see whether there were any nuggets hidden there out of which something constructive could be built.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, it has been reported this morning that the note which was dispatched to the Hungarian Government,<sup>2</sup> through its Minister in Washington, was not delivered, but was returned to the Department. Have you received the note?*

<sup>2</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, Feb. 13, 1956, p. 246.

*Was it returned to you, and, if so, what would be the next step?*

A. Well, it hasn't been returned physically to me because I am a little removed from the spot. I believe that it was physically returned to our Minister there on the ground; that they regard it as offensive.

*Q. Was it returned to our Minister in Budapest?*

A. Yes, that is my understanding.

*Q. The report was that it was not delivered by the Hungarian Minister here—he did not transmit it to his Government; they brought it back to the Department.*

A. Well, I have not been informed of that.

#### Meteorological Balloons

*Q. Mr. Secretary, could you tell us what the position is, under international law, of balloons—meteorological balloons—and also other experiments, such as the circling satellites?*

A. I wish I could tell you, but that whole subject, as I think somebody once said about Russia, is "a mystery wrapped in an enigma" or something to that effect. The question of the ownership of the upper air is a disputable question, and also of the ether above the air. In the main, it is a recognized practice to avoid putting up into the air anything which could interfere with any normal use of the air by anybody else. I understand that these meteorological balloons that have been sent up all around the world—I believe several thousands of them, as a matter of fact—have been drifting over the United States, and they have been launched in California, Alaska, Hawaii, Okinawa, and various places. As I understand it, they have arranged that unless they go up to a height in excess of 30,000 feet they are at once destroyed, and they are supposed to be up at a height of around 50,000 feet, which is way above any normal use of the air, far above any commercial flights. And, as I say, I think several thousands of these have been launched and have been carried by the winds to various places, and there is no known record of their having caused any interference in any commercial flights, or any other flights for that matter.

The legal position is quite obscure. And, for one thing, it is not very easy, when you put up a balloon, to tell with any confidence where it is going to go. It is true that in the main the winds



flow from the west to the east, but that's not uniformly true. Not infrequently they turn around and go in the other direction.

There was one that was put up in California, and which practically went all the way round the world. It transited the United States, the Atlantic, Europe, somewhere through the Asian area, and was last heard of, I understand, in the Western Pacific. I am told that they are gathering an extraordinary amount of useful and new information about these jet stream air currents and, in doing so, at a height which does not practicably involve any risk to anyone. What the legal position is, I wouldn't feel in a position to answer, because I do not believe that the legal position has even been codified, you might say.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, are any other countries similarly launching balloons of this kind, for instance, the Soviet Union, or England, or France?*

A. No. They are not, as far as I know, although several of them are cooperating with us in this particular project.

*Q. There is a balloon that was found 2 or 3 days ago in Japan which came from the Soviet Union. There were reports today from Tokyo.*

A. Well, it is quite likely that they are doing that. I don't know anything about that.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, on the Middle East question, has there been any word from General Burns [Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization] in response to the statement in the communique after the Eden visit last week?*<sup>3</sup>

A. Could I postpone that question a minute? I would just like to make clear, in connection with this talk about balloons, that the United States Government has not directly or indirectly sent up any propaganda balloons whatever designed to transit into the Soviet Union. The note received from the Soviet Union apparently, perhaps deliberately or perhaps not, seemed to confuse these meteorological balloons with certain propaganda balloons which have been sent up by some organizations, I believe primarily in relation to some of the satellite countries. But I want to repeat that the United States Government has not directly or indirectly attempted to send any propa-

ganda material whatever by air into the Soviet Union.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, on that same question, would you care to clear up the other implication—that these balloons carry photographic equipment which are photographing ground installations?*

A. Well, I do believe that they do carry some photographic equipment as part of the devices which, on the one hand, keep track of the speed at which the balloons travel and, on the other hand, reproduce cloud formations which are usually under the balloons. When you fly at 50,000 feet or thereabouts you generally find cloud conditions underneath, and there is some recording, I believe, photographically of certain cloud conditions. It would be quite accidental, I believe, if the photograph happened to pick up anything significant on the ground. Of course, they fly by day and by night. During daytime there are apt to be cloud conditions, so that that aspect of the matter I think could only be quite accidental.

*Q. On that same question, sir, you received the note from the Soviet Union covering this matter?*

A. Yes, we did. And I hope we will get a reply out today or tomorrow.<sup>4</sup>

*Q. Mr. Secretary, is this material made available to scientific organizations of other countries?*

A. Yes, after it is collated, it will, if it is of value—and, in fact, I think they already are satisfied that it will be of value. We hope to make it available, probably on a broad basis, in connection with this forthcoming Geophysical Year.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, what are we doing, if anything, to codify the international law on the question of the balloons?*

A. I don't know whether it is being considered by the international law group of the United Nations or not. I just don't know.

*Q. Would we favor such a consideration, sir?*

A. I would think so, yes.

*Q. Does the American Air Force, for instance, start these balloons from fields in Germany, or other parts of the NATO countries?*

A. I don't know. An announcement was made on this subject—I was looking at it yesterday. A

<sup>4</sup>For the correspondence with the Soviet Union and a Department of Defense press release of Jan. 8, see p. 293.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, Feb. 13, 1956, p. 232.

full press release on this was given out, I think, on the 8th of January, and it spoke about various places in Europe, as well as, I think, it mentioned Okinawa, Alaska, Hawaii, and the like. I don't know just where they are coming from in Western Europe.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, on another subject, Russia seems to be making a certain—*

A. If you are going on to another subject, I have got to give some gentleman here that I cut off first place. Was it you?

#### Middle East

*Q. To go back to the Middle East, Mr. Secretary—*

A. Yes.

*Q. Have you had any word from General Burns in response to the part of the Eden-Eisenhower communique saying that you would look with favor on the request for additional observers?*

A. No, we have not had a reply, but we would hardly expect one. We sent a copy of our communique in that respect to the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, and he in turn, I understand, forwarded it to General Burns, who is now in the Near East. But we have had no reply yet.

*Q. A second point on the Middle East—is it correct, as it has been widely reported, that the United States would favor a one-kilometer withdrawal by the Arabs, Egyptians, and Israeli forces, to make a two-kilometer-wide zone along the border in which these unarmed U.N. observers could more carefully monitor the frontier?*

A. That was not discussed at all during the Eden visit here, and I suppose it would be a suggestion which, if it had merit, would be made by General Burns. If he thought it had merit, we would certainly carefully consider it, but we have not, as far as I am aware, put it forward.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, to go back to the other subject, Russia seems to be making a sudden drive in the last week or two along with Red China to create a new feeling of friendship with Pakistan, as though to break down the Baghdad Pact and interfere with SEATO. I wonder if you would give us your evaluation of Pakistan as a member both of the Baghdad Pact and of the SEATO organization.*

A. We believe that Pakistan is a member of SEATO and also a member of the Baghdad Pact because they are aware of the inherently predatory nature of Soviet foreign policy and also because their people, being deeply religious people, find repugnant the attitude which the Soviet rulers take toward religion. I believe that those two elements are dominant in making the foreign policy of Pakistan. They are fundamental, and I do not think it likely that anything that is now being said by the Soviet rulers would change the feeling of the Pakistani toward Soviet communism.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been published an interview with President Gronchi of Italy which has circulated fairly widely. In it he made certain suggestions he said he would bring to your attention when he comes later this month. I wonder if you have seen this and if you have any comment about it.*

A. Well, I observed that there seemed to be some difference of opinion between President Gronchi and the writer of the article, and I think I had better leave that dispute to be settled as between them.

#### Visit of President Mayer

*Q. Mr. Secretary, you met Mr. Mayer yesterday.<sup>5</sup> Could you tell us the general line of the talk and especially what are the views of his Government about EURATOM? Are you planning to do something to help achieve this project?*

A. Well, our talks with President Mayer were designed primarily to express the deep interest which the Government of the United States has in the project reflected by the Coal and Steel Community. That concept of integration, of which this is the first expression, is a matter of deep concern to us, and we made clear our desire to be helpful and constructive in any way we can. We already have been quite helpful in the granting of a loan of \$100 million by the Export-Import Bank and by the establishment of an ambassadorial diplomatic mission to the Coal and Steel Community and by the official status accorded to the President of the High Authority on his visit here.

<sup>5</sup> For a communique on the visit of René Mayer, President of the High Authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel, see p. 289.

No  
EUR  
asked  
view  
his C  
but i  
ity is  
We c  
at di  
May  
the I  
Q.  
were  
Mr.  
about  
A.  
tunit  
on th  
say i  
in th  
and  
symp  
broa  
Q.  
pres  
deny  
terr  
have  
deni  
that  
A.  
wea  
area  
cove  
who  
up  
diffe  
tion  
ball  
terr  
high  
pro  
men  
not  
The  
jet s  
thin  
char  
par  
gre

Now, you refer to the question, I think, of EURATOM, and I think you referred to and asked whether President Mayer dealt with the views of his Government. Now, at the moment his Government is not the French Government but is the High Authority, and the High Authority is not itself officially involved in this matter. We did have some casual conversation last night at dinner about the whole matter, but President Mayer did not purport in any way to speak for the French Government.

*Q. It has been widely reported that the British were reluctant on the scheme. I wonder whether Mr. Mayer in his position as President talked about that to you or insisted about it.*

A. Well, I expect that he will find some opportunity to express while he is here his own views on that subject. All I think that I can properly say is that President Mayer believes very strongly in the concept which is now embodied in the Coal and Steel Community, and I think he would be sympathetic to an extension of that concept into broader fields.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, to go back to balloons, my impression of what you said earlier is in effect you deny that any balloons have been sent over Soviet territory for military purposes, and say that if any have crossed Soviet frontiers it has been by accident or the chances of the winds, and so on. Is that correct?*

A. I think we had to assume that some of these weather balloons put up into these high jet-stream areas might go a long way and would probably cover many, many countries. I suppose in this whole project so far that weather balloons put up in the air probably have covered 20 to 30 different countries. The meteorological information sought can only be obtained by having these balloons travel greater distances than just the territory of a single state. So the concept of their high flying and wide flying is inherent in the project, as I think was made clear in the announcement. But the information that is being sought is not essentially or even at all military information. There is information about the movement of these jet streams which has a bearing upon a great many things. Some people think that the climatic changes which have occurred recently in various parts of the world are due to the shifting of these great jet streams of air at high altitudes. So,

to locate those streams and measure their velocity and, from time to time, to measure their shifts, is a part of a project which has worldwide significance.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, in anticipating that these balloons would go over the territory of other countries, did the Government take any action or consider the question of notifying other countries that they might?*

A. There was a public notice which was given to all the world at the time when this project was conceived and about to be launched. I am told that the gondolas that these balloons carry have in them requests in various languages, including the Russian language, that if the gondola is found a reward will be paid for its return, so that the information that is available in the apparatus can be obtained and collated with that from other sources.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, does that mean that, provided that there is no determination to the contrary, the United States feels that they have the right to send these balloons at a certain height anywhere around the globe?*

A. Yes, I think that we feel that way, although, as I say, there is no clear international law on the subject. We would be disposed to be respectful of the strong views of any country which was opposed to it. While one can never be sure of where a balloon is going to go when you put it up 50,000 feet into the air, we would be disposed to try to avoid the territory of any country which felt violent objection to it. We would do this, not as a matter of their right but as a matter of decent, friendly relations.

#### Arab-Israel Relations

*Q. Mr. Secretary, in your letter to the 40 Congressmen released yesterday,\* you spoke of the necessity of establishment of friendly relations between Israel and her neighbors and you said we are actively working toward the establishment of such relations. Would you in some way elaborate for us as to the nature of these efforts?*

A. The efforts are those which were, I think, most officially expressed in my speech of August

\* See p. 285.

26,<sup>7</sup> which I have often referred to. The principles of that seem to be sound. We constantly are keeping those proposals before the governments of the countries concerned—the Government of Israel and the Governments of the Arab countries concerned—and emphasizing the great gains which would be achieved if the economic benefits that are portrayed in that program could be realized and the resources of the area devoted to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this Geophysical Year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake?*

A. No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the Geophysical Year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the Geophysical Year.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U.S.S.R.?*

A. Well, I would prefer not to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean approximate height, does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty?*

A. I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of

homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from going over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly everybody admits that, if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory?*

A. Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers?*

A. I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons.

*Q. Do you know other things that were flying saucers that weren't these things?*

A. No, I don't.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons?*

A. Well, those are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

*Q. What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources.*

A. You know, I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Phleger, who is my Legal Adviser, to this particular conference.

That is another question, I think, where inter-

<sup>7</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1955, p. 378.



national law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send ether waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would sup-

pose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you couldn't send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly, openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal.

*Q. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.*

## United States Policy in the Middle East

*Following is an exchange of correspondence between Secretary Dulles and a group of 40 members of the House of Representatives.*

### SECRETARY DULLES TO MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Press release 65 dated February 6

FEBRUARY 6, 1956

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of February 3. I share your concern at the continuing tense situation in the Near East, and at the persistent threat it represents to the peace. Let me say that the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

The Government of Israel, feeling that its peaceful existence is threatened by the large amount of arms now made available to certain Arab countries by the Soviet bloc, desires to purchase from the United States and other countries additional armament to balance what it considers to be the increased threat against it.

The United States recognizes that current developments would create a disparity in armed force between Israel and its Arab neighbors. However, we are not convinced that that disparity can be adequately offset by additional purchases of arms by the State of Israel. Israel has a population of under two million, whereas the Arab population amounts to tens of millions, and they

apparently have been offered access to huge stores of Soviet bloc material. Under this circumstance the security of Israel can perhaps better be assured by means other than an arms race.

The having in hand, by Israel, of equal or superior arms is not the only deterrent to aggression. Israel is a creation of, and member of, the United Nations; the Arab States are also members, and all are solemnly bound by that Charter to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The United Nations organization is capable of providing many forms of protection. Furthermore, the United States in 1950 joined with the United Kingdom and France to declare a policy of action within and without the United Nations to deter aggression by either side against the other. United States policy in that respect has recently been reemphasized in the statement issued on February 1, 1956, by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden.<sup>1</sup> The combined influence of the nations which would, under the United Nations Charter and the Tripartite Declaration, be against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms which could be obtained by either side.

We do not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel. But it is our belief that the security of states in the Near East cannot rest upon arms alone but rather upon the international rule of law and upon the establishment of friendly rela-

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 232.

tions among neighbors. We are actively working toward the establishment of such relations.

In my speech of August 26, 1955,<sup>2</sup> made with President Eisenhower's concurrence, I referred to the fear and tension arising in the area from the lack of fixed permanent boundaries and indicated U.S. willingness to assist the parties in substituting agreed frontiers for armistice lines. To en-

### **Tripartite Meeting on Situation in Middle East**

Press release 73 dated February 8

Representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France met on February 8 to consider the situation in the Middle East. As members of the United Nations, the three Governments share in the responsibility of all members to be alert and vigilant to threats to international peace and security.

In light of the increased tension in the Middle East and in accordance with their undertakings in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France believed it would be useful to discuss their responsibilities under that declaration.

This was a preliminary exchange of views, and further consultations will take place.

courage the parties to work toward such agreement and to assure them that the United States would be prepared to make its contribution to the maintenance of international respect for such boundaries, I stated that the President would recommend that the United States participate in an international guarantee of agreed frontiers. That statement still stands.

You inquire about economic aid. United States policy in the extension of economic aid is based upon the desire to strengthen other free nations. In the case of each aid program we take into account the nature of the project in question and the purpose for which it was intended. I can assure you that United States aid would not be extended for purposes or under circumstances which we judged would undermine peace in any part of the world.

The Arab refugees remain perhaps the most important single source of bitterness existing between the Arab States and Israel. In my speech

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 378.

of August 26, 1955, I proposed that the problem of the Arab refugees be attacked in several ways. I suggested United States participation in an international loan to Israel to assist her in funding her obligation to pay compensation for property left in Israel by the refugees and which is now being utilized by Israel. I recommended assistance to Israel and the Arab States in the rehabilitation of the refugees both by repatriation to Israel to such extent as may be feasible and resettlement in adjoining Arab States. In this connection the Arab States and Israel have accepted, on a technical basis, the Jordan Valley plan which would provide new economic opportunities for several hundred thousand refugees. But final political approval remains to be achieved. Thus, some progress has been realized, but much remains to be done.

I know that you all understand that it is not practical, or in the interest of the goals we seek, to discuss publicly all of the factors involved in this complicated situation. I know you also recognize that the problems of this area must be studied in the larger context of the free world's unceasing struggle against international communism. I have, however, no hesitation in declaring that the United States, seeking for itself to avoid involvement in war, is earnestly striving as a friend of both Israel and its Arab neighbors to relieve the present tension in the area. If the political and economic developments should subsequently become such as to make Congressional action desirable or necessary, the President would, of course, promptly communicate with the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

### **MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO SECRETARY DULLES**

FEBRUARY 3, 1956

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES  
*Secretary of State*  
*Department of State*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know many of us, in our individual capacity of Members of Congress, have been in continuing communica-

tion  
the tr  
Your  
basic  
plem  
In yo  
probl  
about  
lack  
and i  
of po  
of on  
the o  
refug  
probl  
We  
you  
Midd  
ents  
conce  
ing m  
Israe  
We  
detai  
need  
gover  
Fran  
1950,  
State  
level  
their  
defer  
the d  
fear  
ment  
sourc  
defer  
tivel  
of th  
the o  
prot  
tion  
W  
East  
defer  
medi  
of pe  
be u  
fecti  
ciati  
the T

tion with the Department of State concerning the tragic increase of tensions in the Middle East. Your statement of August 26, 1955, outlined the basic concepts which could, through effective implementation, bring peace to this troubled area. In your statement, you outlined certain specific problems requiring solution in order to bring about peaceful conditions. You referred to the lack of fixed permanent boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the fear of an imbalance of power which might lead to violence on the part of one of the parties to the controversy against the other, and to the tragic plight of the 900,000 refugees whose displacement presents a continual problem.

We, therefore, proceed from the premise that you recognize the great danger to peace in the Middle East. We and the millions of constituents whom we, collectively, represent are gravely concerned about the immediate necessity for finding means to bring about a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world.

We, therefore, would like to state in further detail some of the problems which we consider need to be met by our Government and associated governments particularly Great Britain and France. Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole". Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase through private sources defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively, taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

To achieve this end, the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guarantee of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the free world. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

Second, we agree with your August 26th, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world Communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this Administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which in threaten-

ing the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world.

We would much appreciate an early response to this urgent expression of our concern.

Member	District	State
HUGH SCOTT	6th	Pennsylvania
ALBERT P. MORANO	4th	Connecticut
KENNETH B. KEATING	38th	New York
EDMUND P. RADWAN	41st	New York
JAMES G. FULTON	27th	Pennsylvania
THOMAS M. PELLY	1st	Washington
THOR C. TOLLEFSON	6th	Washington
KARL M. LECOMPTE	4th	Iowa
R. WALTER RIEHLMAN	35th	New York
ALBERT W. CRETILLA	3rd	Connecticut
HOWARD H. BAKER	2nd	Tennessee
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.	2nd	Connecticut
TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN	11th	Illinois
ALVIN M. BENTLEY	8th	Michigan
LAURENCE CURTIS	10th	Massachusetts
GORDON CANFIELD	8th	New Jersey
ROBERT W. KEAN	12th	New Jersey
JOHN P. SAYLOR	22nd	Pennsylvania
JOSEPH L. CARRIGG	10th	Pennsylvania
STUYVESANT N. WAINWRIGHT	1st	New York
STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN	2nd	New York
FRANK J. BECKER	3rd	New York
FRANCIS E. DORN	12th	New York
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE	28th	New York
BERNARD W. KEARNEY	32nd	New York
WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS	34th	New York
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG	39th	New York
THOMAS B. CURTIS	2nd	Missouri
JAMES T. PATTERSON	5th	Connecticut
WILLIAM E. MILLER	40th	New York
ROBERT J. CORRETT	29th	Pennsylvania
JACKSON B. CHASE	2nd	Nebraska
PAUL A. FINO	25th	New York
RUTH THOMPSON	3rd	Michigan
GORDON L. McDONOUGH	15th	California
DEWITT S. HYDE	6th	Maryland
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.	17th	New York
CARBOLL D. KEARNS	24th	Pennsylvania
DONALD L. JACKSON	16th	California
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.	5th	New Jersey

## ICA Gives Gamma Globulin To Combat Epidemic in India

A half million cubic centimeters of gamma globulin have been sent by air to India by the International Cooperation Administration as a gift of the people of the United States to help that country combat an epidemic of infectious hepatitis in the New Delhi area, ICA announced on January 27.

Gamma globulin is recognized as an effective preventive of hepatitis, sometimes called yellow jaundice, among persons exposed to the disease. The 500,000 cc.'s sent to India is estimated to be enough to provide protection for more than 200,000 persons who might have been exposed.

The gamma globulin was made available to ICA by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis at well below existing prices. The cost, including air freight, was about \$425,000. The Foundation was able to supply the gamma globulin from its reserves in Chicago without any danger of depletion of supplies needed for U.S. domestic purposes. It has been stockpiling gamma globulin for several years because of its effectiveness against polio, but the Salk vaccine has lessened the need for this purpose in this country.

Director John B. Hollister of ICA has expressed appreciation to the Foundation for making the supplies available so that the United States could help India in combating the epidemic.

## Exchange of Views With President of Coal and Steel Authority

*Following are the texts of a joint announcement released on February 8 and a joint communique released on February 9 regarding the visit to Washington of René Mayer, President of the High Authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel.*

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEBRUARY 8

White House press release dated February 8

The President of the High Authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel, M. René Mayer, called on the President this morning. M. Mayer discussed developments in the European Coal and Steel Community and its prospects for the future.

The President expressed to M. Mayer the friendly interest of the United States in the program of the European Coal and Steel Community, and in the activities of this first supranational institution in Europe. He assured M. Mayer that the United States regards continued progress towards European integration as a vital contribution towards security, welfare and freedom during the years ahead.



## COMMUNIQUE OF FEBRUARY 9

Press release 75 dated February 9

During the past three days, the President of the High Authority for Coal and Steel, M. René Mayer, has been in Washington for an exchange of views with officials of the United States Government.

President Mayer called on President Eisenhower. M. Mayer discussed with President Eisenhower developments in the European Coal and Steel Community and its prospects for the future.

The President expressed to M. Mayer the friendly interest of the United States in the program of the European Coal and Steel Community, and in the activities of this first supranational institution in Europe. He assured M. Mayer that the United States regards continued progress towards European integration as a vital contribution towards security, welfare and freedom during the years ahead.

In addition to his conversation with the President, President Mayer discussed questions of mutual interest between the European Coal and Steel Community and the United States, among other things the present situation of coal and scrap markets. These conversations took place with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Export-Import Bank, and the Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System.

As President of the Executive of Europe's first supranational institution, M. Mayer reviewed the achievements of the European Community for Coal and Steel; this review was also made in relation to other initiatives being taken in Europe to extend European economic unity.

During President Mayer's call on Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State pointed out that the United States had recognized the importance of its friendly relationship to the European Community for Coal and Steel by establishing recently a Mission to the High Authority headed by an officer of ambassadorial rank.<sup>1</sup> President Mayer and Secretary Dulles voiced the expectation that this Mission would contribute to the strengthening of the close and cordial relations which exist between the European Community for Coal and Steel and the United States.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1955, p. 643.

February 20, 1956

375095-56-3

## Tariff Concessions to Sweden

Press release 64 dated February 6

As announced by the Department of State on August 22, 1955,<sup>1</sup> in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol for the Accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, U.S. concessions to countries other than Japan in connection with the negotiations for Japan's accession will be made effective 30 days after such countries notify the Executive Secretary of the general agreement that their concessions to Japan are being placed in effect.

On January 16, 1956, the Government of Sweden gave such notification regarding the concessions contained in its schedule to the Protocol. Accordingly the United States will on February 15, 1956, apply the concessions initially negotiated with Sweden which are not already in effect. The products affected are:

Item Designation	Description
38	Extracts, dyeing, and tanning, not containing alcohol: Oak
1409 [second]	Sulphite wrapping paper not specially provided for
1536 [first]	Candles

The President has notified the Secretary of the Treasury of the effective date for these concessions to Sweden. The text of the notification follows.

### President's Letter to Secretary Humphrey<sup>1</sup>

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, February 6, 1956.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to my proclamation of July 22, 1955<sup>2</sup> carrying out the Protocol of Terms of Accession by Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On January 16, 1956, Sweden gave to the Executive Secretary to the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement the notification, referred to in paragraph 3 of the Protocol for the accession of Japan, regarding the application of concessions which it had negotiated initially with Japan. Accordingly, pursuant to the procedure described in Part I (b) (1) of the above-mentioned proclama-

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1955, p. 397.

<sup>2</sup> 21 Fed. Reg. 829.

<sup>3</sup> BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1955, p. 226.

tion, I hereby notify you that items 38, 1409 [second], and 1536 [first] in Part I of Schedule XX to the said Protocol shall not be withheld pursuant to paragraph 4 of the said Protocol on or after February 15, 1956.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,  
*Secretary of the Treasury.*

## The Present Situation in Germany

*by Under Secretary Hoover*<sup>1</sup>

A few days ago I returned from a brief visit to West Germany and Berlin. The purpose of my trip was to take part in the 10th anniversary of RIAS—Radio in the American Sector of Berlin—whose programs are primarily directed to the captive population in the Soviet Zone of East Germany.<sup>2</sup>

After visiting Berlin, one begins to realize how very important an institution like RIAS can be to the lives and hopes of these people. It has served for a decade as a link between the East Germans, who are being held against their will behind the Iron Curtain, and the outside free world. It has helped to maintain their faith in the fundamental concepts of freedom and justice.

A similar role is being played by the Free Europe Committee, financed by the privately organized Crusade for Freedom. Through broadcasts over Radio Free Europe, and by other non-governmental means, the support and sympathy of the free world is communicated to the captive people of Eastern Europe. This private endeavor plays a vital role in carrying the message of freedom and hope and is worthy of the widespread assistance it receives each year from the American people.

I would like to discuss with you today one of the

<sup>1</sup> Address made before the Foreign Policy Association at New York, N. Y., on Feb. 10 (press release 76).

<sup>2</sup> For text of Mr. Hoover's address at Berlin, see BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 242.

## Visit of Prime Minister of Ireland

White House press release dated February 8

The Prime Minister of Ireland, John A. Costello, has accepted an invitation to be the guest of the United States Government in March. It is anticipated that the Prime Minister will be in Washington from March 14 to 17. The official visit will also include 3 days in New York City later in the month.

most vital problems affecting world peace—the reunification of Germany as a free and sovereign country.

A trip to Bonn and Berlin, no matter how brief, impresses one with the harsh facts of the artificial partition that dominates German life today. What should have been a single state, with the traditional seat of its central government in Berlin, remains divided into two basic areas: the Federal Republic, with its provisional capital in Bonn, and the Soviet Zone or so-called German Democratic Republic.

The injustice of this continuing division of Germany by the Soviets, 10 years after the end of World War II, must be peacefully resolved. But unification cannot be achieved at the cost of true liberty for the German people. Much as the West Germans want to be joined with their countrymen who are being held captive by the Soviets in the Eastern Zone, they know unity must be based on freedom if it is to have lasting meaning.

In the two adjacent but divided parts of Germany the forces of communism and the forces of freedom have each left their imprint for the world to see. Because it so clearly depicts two contrasting philosophies of government, the postwar period has a particular significance. No nation and no people can afford to ignore the lesson which has been so vividly taught in Germany during this time.

Following the war these two systems began to function side by side and under the same conditions. They dealt with populations of the same national heritage and the same economic background.

East Germany has been a tragic example of what happens under Communist domination. West Germany affords a shining example of liberty and prosperity.

#### **A Tribute to German Energy**

The phenomenal economic and political recovery in West Germany will stand forever as a tribute to the energy and ability of the German people at work under a free society. Out of this soil of freedom, and with the assistance of the West, there has grown a stable, sovereign, and democratic government that has commanded worldwide respect. Industrial production has doubled over prewar levels. Today West Germany has a thriving economy with a standard of living no one considered possible 10 years ago. It supports not only its own expanding postwar population but an additional 10 million people who have come from Communist areas.

In this new free society, all of its elements have contributed and flourished—industry, labor, agriculture, churches, schools, professions, arts, and political parties. The people of the Federal Republic have the right to think freely, to speak freely, and to have a truly free press. They have a constitutional government—with their representatives freely elected, without interference or coercion, and free to shape the destiny of their own country. They are in every sense a free nation. In his dedication to those principles, Chancellor Adenauer has been a source of inspiration to free men everywhere.

Progress—if you want to call it that—in the zone that the Soviets have ruled is in sharp contrast to that of the Federal Republic. The grim facts are well known, but they need to be repeated over and over. In no other way can the moral force of humanity in the rest of the world be brought to bear on this travesty of justice.

What are the economic facts of life in this Communist area of East Germany? Workers must meet ever-increasing goals of output without adequate compensation. Their so-called "trade union" is merely a government instrument for propaganda, restraint, and control. They have

destroyed the finest traditions of independence and responsibility in the trade union movement. Farmers have been deprived of freedom and incentive by enforced collectivization. They must produce high-delivery quotas at artificially low prices. Basic foods and consumer items are in short supply. The standard of living is ruthlessly depressed below the level that their hard work would be expected to provide. Only one-third as many housing units are built in East Germany each year, in proportion to the population, as there are in the Federal Republic.

#### **Contrasts in Berlin**

The contrast is there, it is real, and it is appalling. It is even more striking between the two sections of Berlin.

The free sector of Berlin, despite its geographic isolation from West Germany and its artificial separation from the surrounding countryside, has made a remarkable recovery. Its 2 million people are far better off than the million East Berliners whose part of the city is directly linked to the economy of the surrounding Soviet Zone. The contrast was obvious during my brief visit. East of the Brandenburg Gate, life seemed drab and oppressive. One could sense the depressed outlook of a regimented people under Communist domination.

In West Berlin, however, one is impressed by the open countenances and confident manner of a people for whom freedom has become a matter of real personal significance. They are cheerful and going about their lives with a definite purpose. They have raised the level of their economy, primarily as a result of their trade with the Federal Republic in the West, until they are now virtually self-supporting.

It would be hard to find any area in the world more stanch in its repudiation of communism than the Federal Republic, and particularly the free part of Berlin.

The full force of the anti-Communist attitude is difficult to comprehend without visiting Germany and learning firsthand of the deep-rooted nature of German hostility toward the Communist system. One-fifth of the population in free Germany are refugees from Communist oppression. Several million more are veterans who have experienced life under Communist domination. Their appreciation of the values of freedom is firm and

unwavering. Furthermore, West Germans are constantly reminded of the real meaning of life under communism by the reports that come from their relatives and friends who are still in the Soviet Zone. They want none of it.

During my visit in West Berlin I had occasion to stop in one of the industrial districts close to the dividing line with the Soviet sector. I found that in the days soon after the war the Communist vote was over 35 percent. As time went on, however, the people of the area had a firsthand opportunity to observe the regimentation and the loss of freedom in the Soviet Zone. The Communist vote dwindled steadily, until in the last election it reached an alltime low of less than 5 percent. This is a dramatic example of the increasingly deep-seated feeling against communism that is so prevalent in the free parts of Germany.

A similar attitude appears in the Communist-dominated territory. It is reliably estimated that an overwhelming proportion of the captive German population would repudiate communism if they could exercise their free will in a truly free election. Obviously the Communist regime in East Germany cannot speak for the population under its domination.

The Soviets are constantly telling the world of the social and economic gains of communism in East Germany. The East Germans clearly recognize these claims are a false front to cover the machinery of an iron dictatorship. Widespread popular uprisings by them indicated to the world that a free, secret, and uninfluenced ballot would have run the Communists out of office by an overwhelming vote.

#### Refugees From East Germany

Perhaps the most impressive testimony to the failures of the Communist East German system is the fact that last year over a quarter of a million East Germans left their homes, farms, relatives and lifetime surroundings behind them in their determination to seek more freedom. It is particularly significant that a large proportion were from the younger generation. In many cases the parents made the sacrifice of staying behind so that their children could grow up in a free society where they could choose their own careers and their own jobs. They wanted freedom of opportunity.

Those who left the Communist area were not

merely protesting political, military, or economic hardships, however desperate they may have been. They were not seeking simply to improve their economic well-being. They were determined to regain the freedom and human dignity which was their birthright.

There are certain inescapable conclusions to be reached, as one returns from Germany, and after reviewing the last 10 years of German history:

First, were it not for the Communist apparatus that has been imposed by the Soviets and backed up by some 22 Soviet Army divisions, the East German people would move immediately to join their 50 million countrymen in West Berlin and the free Federal Republic. This urge for reunification is overwhelming in all parts of Germany.

Second, the puppet regime that has been set up within the Soviet Zone cannot truly represent the people of East Germany. Irrespective of what it is called, it is still a puppet and not a nation. It is an affront to free nations everywhere.

Third, the moral indignation of the world must be brought to bear on the injustices of Communist occupation. We must drive home to free nations everywhere the insincerity and falsity of the Soviet pretensions to peace and good will, while they continue to hold 17 million East Germans in captive domination with no opportunity to express their free will. The world must not be allowed to forget the injustices of Soviet imperialism in Europe. So long as the Soviet Union maintains its grip on 100 million people in East Germany and the other satellite countries, the conscience of the world must be kept fully aware of these injustices. To be lulled into acceptance of the *status quo* is to prepare the way for further loss of freedom. As Secretary Dulles said in Chicago last December, "We shall not seek to cure these injustices by ourselves invoking force. But we can and will constantly keep these injustices at the forefront of human consciousness."<sup>3</sup>

Fourth, the Western World has given full support to the efforts of the German people to maintain their freedom in West Berlin and in the Federal Republic. We must leave no doubt in their minds, nor in the minds of the Communists, that we will continue to do so.

The struggle ahead will not be easy. It will require patience and persistence. But there is a source of confidence in the moral integrity of

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Dec. 19, 1955, p. 1003.



the free world which we share with the Germans and with other free nations everywhere. Free-world strength is not only a matter of military defense, or of economic and scientific development. It is above all else the strength of the moral, spiritual, and intellectual heritage of the Western World. It recognizes political liberty and the individual rights of free men as inherent in a just and lasting peace.

## Protest on Para-Military Units in East Berlin

*Following is the text of a note from U. S. Ambassador James B. Conant to Soviet Ambassador G. M. Pushkin delivered at Berlin on February 10. Similar notes were delivered by the British and French Ambassadors.*

Press release 77 dated February 10

I am instructed to inform you of the growing concern of my Government over the development in recent months of para-military activities in the Soviet Sector of Berlin. These activities assumed an ominous form when some thousands of civilians, armed with machine pistols and other weapons, marched through East Berlin in a demonstration on January 15. We note that this demonstration even included the participation of young boys and girls carrying firearms.

The formation of para-military groups and their employment in provocative displays have serious implications which my Government cannot ignore. Their continued activity can only create unrest among the population and result in a heightening of international tension in the Berlin area.

Such activity could have the gravest consequences. As your Government is aware, the United States, in common with the United Kingdom and France, has formally undertaken to defend the safety and welfare of the populations in their sectors against attack from any quarter. The United States cannot recognize any waiver of responsibility by the Soviet Government for acts which could lead to any such attack.

As you are aware, the bearing of arms by members of the general public is prohibited by a body of quadripartite legislation to which the British, French and United States commandants attach great importance and which they have been careful to observe in their sectors. My Government

hopes that the Soviet Government as the responsible authority will prevent the local authorities in the Soviet Sector from creating dangers to the peace of Berlin through the sponsorship of activities by armed civilian groups or through other threats directed at the Western Sectors.

## Correspondence With U.S.S.R. Concerning Weather Balloons

### U.S. NOTE OF FEBRUARY 8

Press release 72 dated February 8

*Following is the text of the U.S. reply to the Soviet note of February 4, 1956, regarding meteorological balloons which was delivered on February 8 by the American Embassy at Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.*

The Ambassador of the United States of America presents his compliments to the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs and, under instructions from his Government, has the honor to reply as follows to the Soviet Government's note of February 4, 1956.

In the Soviet Government note there is an apparent confusion between a publicized meteorological operation and previous Soviet allegations concerning the launching of propaganda balloons directed toward the Soviet Union. In this latter connection, the U.S. Government recalls certain oral observations were made by the Soviet Foreign Ministry on September 28 to the American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow who denied any U.S. Government responsibility for activities of which the Soviet Government complained. The U.S. Government wishes to reaffirm that it is not directly or indirectly participating in any project to despatch propaganda balloons over the Soviet Union.

Insofar as the Soviet Government's note pertains to meteorological balloons, the U.S. Government is happy to supply information complementary to what is already public knowledge. Under United States auspices, a meteorological survey is being carried out by the launching of balloons which are in effect miniature "satellites" and which remain aloft for several days at a very considerable height placing them out of the range of commercial aircraft. A number of balloons have been launched in several parts of the world and many have been passing over the United

States. For example, a balloon sent up on January 8 in California, transited the U.S., the Atlantic Ocean, and the Eurasian Continent and was identified on January 20 transmitting homing signals from the Western Pacific.

The project was explained in a press release issued in Washington on January 8 which included pictures and details of the balloons. The Soviet Government is presumably aware of this announcement, but for convenient reference a copy is attached. While most of the balloon flights have taken place in the U.S., the announced opening of additional research stations in Europe, Alaska and Hawaii raised no objection by any government.

The balloons are equipped with instruments to measure and record meteorological phenomena such as air jet streams, and with photographic apparatus to provide pictures of cloud formations which bear on air movements at various velocities. Much valuable scientific information is being accumulated. It is hoped that this method of meteorological research will contribute substantially to the forthcoming International Geophysical Year programs.

The declared purpose of the project is made clear by the fact that the equipment itself contains instructions in several languages, including Russian, for its recovery and delivery to the authorities charged with the evaluation of the data obtained. In the interest of scientific research, it would be much appreciated if the Soviet Government would return the instruments which have come into its possession.

Similar surveys have been conducted for some time through the launching of some thousands of meteorological balloons over the United States. These have been equipped with safety devices and have constituted no hazard even to dense civilian air traffic. As explained in the announcement, the balloons observed by the Soviet Government are equipped with the same safety devices.

The United States Government would be happy to explain further to the Soviet Government the safety measures incorporated in the project. Provisionally, however, in order to avoid misunderstandings, and in view of the Soviet Government's objection, the United States Government will seek to avoid the launching of additional balloons which, on the basis of known data, might transit the USSR.

## Department of Defense Press Release Dated January 8, 1956

### AIR FORCE METEOROLOGICAL SURVEY EXPANDED IN NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

An Air Force meteorological survey, commonly known as "Moby Dick" here in the United States, is being expanded to include other areas in the Northern Hemisphere.

This research program has been in progress for the past two years to obtain meteorological research data above 30,000 feet. Large plastic balloons, which have often been mistaken for "flying saucers", will carry meteorological instruments, including cameras and radio equipment to record and telemeter atmospheric information. This method of obtaining meteorological research data might be of great use in the International Geophysical Year programs that will be conducted during 1957-1958.

Balloons are, in effect, miniature "satellites" that can remain aloft for several days and thereby collect continuous research data. The research data thus obtained will enable our scientists to better understand the many meteorological phenomena that exist in the vast unexplored region surrounding the earth. It is likely that information will be obtained that will be of importance when a man-made satellite is fired into the ionosphere within the next few years.

The program is designed to obtain simultaneous meteorological observations in the Northern Hemisphere. It is expected that new information will be obtained on jet streams, frontal systems, storm formations, electromagnetic radiation and radio propagation.

By studying the complete general circulation and pressure patterns we can learn more about the causes of severe weather. It is hoped that the information obtained may help explain recent climatic changes that have affected the United States. The 1955 hurricane paths shifted from their normal courses and brought disaster along our Eastern coastal area. Dust storms and gale winds caused extensive damage to crops in the Midwest. Heavy rainfall caused floods in the West and Northwest that have never been experienced before.

The U.S. Weather Bureau is interested in this program and the data will be analyzed in an attempt to improve forecasting and to provide early warnings of severe weather phenomena.

In the course of more than 4,000 balloon flights that have been conducted, no instances of personal injury or severe property damage has occurred. In order to preserve and continue this excellent safety record, foolproof safety devices are used on all balloon flights. Experience has also shown that balloon flights are not a hazard to aviation when flown at altitudes above 30,000 feet. Since commercial aviation and most military aviation are presently conducted below 30,000 feet, balloons are prevented from floating below this level by safety devices. A balloon that fails to reach 30,000 feet within 50-60 minutes after release is automatically destroyed and the equipment is lowered to earth by parachutes. Likewise, any balloon that descends to 30,000 after once passing through that altitude, is also destroyed.

The destruction of the balloon is rather simple. By cutting away the attached equipment by use of a safety device, the balloon rises rapidly into the sub-freezing stratosphere where expansion of lifting gas will cause it to burst, just as ordinary meteorological sounding balloons expand and burst at high altitude. As plastic material becomes brittle at sub-freezing temperatures, the balloon, upon bursting actually shatters into many small pieces that float harmlessly to earth.

Most of the balloon flights have been conducted in the U.S., however, the cooperation of other governments has made it possible for small research stations to be established in other countries. Meteorological balloons have been flown from Brazil, Panama, Scotland, Japan and Okinawa. The addition of research stations in Europe, Alaska and Hawaii during 1956 will increase the scope of this program.

#### SOVIET NOTE OF FEBRUARY 4

[Unofficial translation]

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to state the following to the Government of the USA:

During January of this year there have been seized in the air space of the Soviet Union a large number of aerial balloons up to fifteen meters in diameter with apparatus of various types, devices and other cargoes suspended therefrom. The above-mentioned balloons are balloons of polyethylene with capacity of up to 1600 cubic meters. The total weight of the cargo suspended from one such balloon reaches 650 kilos.

According to information at the disposal of the Soviet Government the release of these aerial balloons is carried out by American military organizations from the territory of Western Germany, and also from American air bases located on the territory of certain states bordering on the Soviet Union. The apparatus suspended from these aerial balloons includes automatically operated photo cameras for aerial survey, radio transmitters, radio receivers and other things. An examination of the captured balloons shows that both the balloons themselves and the apparatus suspended therefrom are manufactured in the United States of America. This is shown in part by such labels on various parts of the apparatus as "Made in USA" and the names of the American firms producing these parts—Atlas Engineering Company, Roxbury, Massachusetts; Elgin Neoxatic, Inc., Los Angeles, California; American Phenolic Corporation, Chicago, etc.

In addition to the above-mentioned balloons American organizations continue to release into the air spaces of the Soviet Union balloons with cargo consisting of leaflets hostile to the USSR and propaganda literature.

As is known, already on September 28, 1955 the Soviet Government approached the Government of the United States on the question of the adoption of necessary meas-

ures in order that American organizations should cease the release from the territory of Western Germany of aerial balloons with cargo suspended therefrom. The Soviet Government pointed out that the flights of such balloons create a danger for airplanes flying on the internal lines of the Soviet Union and also on international lines going over the territories of the Soviet Union and of a series of European states.

The Soviet Government notes that the Government of the United States up to the present has not taken measures for the cessation of the above-mentioned impermissible activities of American organizations. According to information at the disposal of the competent Soviet organs the flights of such aerial balloons over the territory of the Soviet Union have not only not ceased but have recently assumed greater proportions.

It is not difficult to imagine the situation that would arise if states into whose air space the above-mentioned aerial balloons with cargo suspended therefrom are released embarked on the same path and began to release comparable flying mechanisms in the direction of the air space of those countries which bear responsibility for the illegal activities mentioned above.

The release into the air space of the Soviet Union of balloons with the cargoes mentioned above which are carried out by American military organizations represents a crude violation of the air space of the Soviet Union and a violation of the generally accepted principle of international law in accordance with which each state has full and exclusive sovereignty in regard to the air space over its territory.

In accordance with this principle of the sovereignty of states over their air space the flight of any form of flying apparatus into the air space of any state can take place only with the permission of the state in question. In view of the foregoing the above-mentioned activities of the American military organizations represent violation of the territorial integrity of the USSR, are contrary to the obligations assumed by the United States Government under the Charter of the United Nations and are incompatible with normal relations between states.

The Soviet Government makes a decisive protest and demands from the United States Government the taking of measures for the immediate cessation of the above-mentioned impermissible activities of the American military organizations.

#### Letters of Credence

James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President, announced on February 7 that the President had that day received the credentials of the newly appointed Ambassador of Chile, Mario Rodriguez Altamirano.

## Territorial Waters and Related Matters

### ACTION TAKEN BY THE THIRD MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS MEXICO CITY, JANUARY 17-FEBRUARY 4, 1956

At its meeting at Mexico City, January 17-February 4, the Inter-American Council of Jurists adopted a resolution on the subject of territorial waters and related matters by a vote of 15 to 1, with 5 abstentions (Annex 1). This resolution, entitled "Principles of Mexico on the Juridical Regime of the Sea," was vigorously opposed by the United States Representative, who, in a statement included in the Final Act of the meeting, attacked the resolution on the grounds of both its substance and the manner in which it was adopted (Annex 2).

The Tenth Inter-American Conference (Caracas, 1954) in Resolution LXXXIV resolved, among other things, that the Council of the Organization of American States should convoke a Specialized Conference for the purpose of studying as a whole the different aspects of the juridical and economic system covering the submarine shelf, oceanic waters, and the natural resources in the light of present-day scientific knowledge, and that the Council request pertinent inter-American organizations to render necessary cooperation in the preparatory work that the Specialized Conference requires.

Pursuant to this decision, the Council of the OAS convened the Specialized Conference for March 15, 1956, at Ciudad Trujillo. In preparation for the Conference, it requested the Inter-American Council of Jurists, its technical advisory organ on legal matters, to make a preparatory study on the legal aspects of the matters to be considered at Ciudad Trujillo. It was made clear that the purpose of this study was to furnish the Specialized Conference with pertinent background information and that any conclusions or decisions were to be reserved to the Conference. The agenda item for the Third Meeting of the Inter-

American Council of Jurists covering this matter was formulated by the Council of the OAS in the following terms:

"Topic I (a)—Regime of Territorial Waters and Related Matters: Preparatory Study for the Inter-American Specialized Conference Called for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference."

#### Situation Confronting the Council of Jurists

The Council of Jurists found itself handicapped at the very outset of its consideration of the topic by lack of any kind of working document on the subject. The Inter-American Juridical Committee, the Council's permanent committee, had been requested to prepare a preliminary study but for a variety of reasons declined to do so. In view of the complete absence of preparatory materials, which as a method of procedure the Council of Jurists had consistently maintained to be necessary to enable it to proceed on a sound basis in the consideration of a topic, the United States early in the general debate indicated that in its opinion the most constructive contribution which the Council of Jurists could make to the work of the Specialized Conference under the circumstances would be: (1) to have an exposition of views of the respective governments on the general subject and to transmit the proceedings of the discussions to Ciudad Trujillo; and (2) to request the appropriate technical agency of the OAS to undertake a collection and systematic organization of pertinent background materials, particularly national and international acts and practices.

#### General Debate

During the first week of the meeting, action on the topic was limited to informal conversations



among the delegations. This procedure was agreed upon considering that it would be advisable to allow time for an exchange of views on the controversial issues involved before taking them up in public session.

During the general debate on the subject, 17 delegations took the opportunity to present the views and attitudes of their respective governments on various aspects of the general problem. This general debate served the useful purpose of affording an opportunity for a very substantial number of the American governments for the first time to state their views on principal aspects of this important subject. The debate, however, did not include a discussion of the issues raised, being confined to the presentation of the general statements of governments, nor were any draft resolutions submitted for consideration.

#### **Nine-Country Resolution**

As the general debate came to an end, copies of a draft resolution sponsored by eight countries (Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay, later joined by Costa Rica) were distributed in Committee I. The proposal incorporated, in extreme terms, one of the two principal points of view expressed during the general debate. In its presentation no statement was made by any of the proponents in explanation or justification of its contents.

The resolution declared that the three-mile limit of territorial waters "does not constitute a rule of general international law." In its place, according to the resolution, "each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense."

The extreme character of the resolution is also reflected in its articles dealing with the conservation of living resources. The coastal States have, the resolution asserts, "the right of exclusive exploitation of species closely related to the coast, the life of the country, or the needs of the coastal population"—a formula which is sufficiently elastic to suit the requirements of the most extravagant claims.

On the highly technical subject of base lines and bays, the resolution also came to firm conclusions despite the fact, as the United States

Representative pointed out in the one session when an opportunity was given to comment upon the resolution, that there had been virtually no consideration of these highly technical points during the entire session of the Council.

#### **United States Declaration and Reservation**

The reasons for the United States opposition to the resolution are summarized in the declaration and reservation included in the Final Act. The United States delegation made this important statement after consultation with, and upon the authorization of, the Department of State.

As the U.S. declaration points out, the resolution suffers from serious substantive defect in that it seeks to lay down rules which fail to take into consideration fundamental and well-accepted principles of international law, such as the principle of freedom of the seas, and the rights and interests derived from international law and treaty by States other than the adjacent coastal State. Furthermore, the resolution contains pronouncements based on scientific and economic assumptions for which no supporting evidence was presented.

Perhaps of greater concern to the United States is the manner in which the resolution was adopted. On the day after the resolution was introduced in Committee I, the delegates of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the United States, and Venezuela raised various questions and considerations regarding the resolution. The proponents refrained from answering these observations and on the following day, rejecting appeals for more time to consider the proposal, put the resolution through by a vote of 15 in favor, 1 against (United States), and 5 abstentions (Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua). The same vote was repeated in the plenary session.

In signing the Final Act, 11 countries entered reservations to the "Principles of Mexico" resolution. These included the United States and the five countries which abstained on the resolution, as well as five which had voted in the affirmative.

#### **Cuban Proposal**

Immediately following the vote on the nine-country resolution, the Cuban delegate introduced a resolution providing that the proceedings of Committee I relating to territorial waters and related matters, together with any conclusions

reached through the discussions, be transmitted to the Specialized Conference with the character of a preparatory study. Although objected to by proponents of the first resolution on the grounds that it modified the declaratory nature of their document, the Cuban resolution was approved by a vote of 11 to 9 (Annex 3). This resolution served, at least from a procedural standpoint, to bring the nine-country resolution more within the terms of the assignment made to the Council of Jurists by the Council of the OAS.

## ANNEX 1

### RESOLUTION XIII

#### PRINCIPLES OF MEXICO ON THE JURIDICAL REGIME OF THE SEA

##### WHEREAS:

The topic "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American Conference Provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference" was included by the Council of the Organization of American States in the agenda of this Third Meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists; and

Its conclusions on the subject are to be transmitted to the Specialized Conference soon to be held,

The Inter-American Council of Jurists

RECOGNIZES as the expression of the juridical conscience of the Continent, and as applicable between the American States, the following rules, among others; and

DECLARES that the acceptance of these principles does not imply and shall not have the effect of renouncing or weakening the position maintained by the various countries of America on the question of how far territorial waters should extend.

##### A

#### Territorial Waters

1. The distance of three miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called "territorial waters" is justifiable.

2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense.

##### B

#### Continental Shelf

The rights of the coastal State with respect to the seabed and subsoil of the continental shelf extend also to the natural resources found there, such as petroleum, hydrocarbons, mineral substances, and all marine, animal, and

vegetable species that live in a constant physical and biological relationship with the shelf, not excluding the benthonic species.

##### C

#### Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas

1. Coastal States, following scientific and technical principles, have the right to adopt measures of conservation and supervision necessary for the protection of the living resources of the sea contiguous to their coasts, beyond the territorial waters. Measures that may be taken by a coastal State in such case shall not prejudice rights derived from international agreements to which it is a party, nor shall they discriminate against foreign fishermen.

2. Coastal States have, in addition, the right of exclusive exploitation of species closely related to the coast, the life of the country, or the needs of the coastal population, as in the case of species that develop in territorial waters and subsequently migrate to the high seas, or when the existence of certain species has an important relation with an industry or activity essential to the coastal country, or when the latter is carrying out important works that will result in the conservation or increase of the species.

##### D

#### Base Lines

1. The breadth of territorial waters shall be measured, in principle, from the low-water line along the coast, as marked on large-scale marine charts, officially recognized by the coastal State.

2. Coastal States may draw straight base lines that do not follow the low-water line when circumstances require this method because the coast is deeply indented or cut into, or because there are islands in its immediate vicinity, or when such a method is justified by the existence of economic interests peculiar to a region of the coastal State. In any of these cases the method may be employed of drawing a straight line connecting the outermost points of the coast, islands, islets, keys, or reefs. The drawing of such base lines must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coast, and the sea areas lying within these lines must be sufficiently linked to the land domain.

3. Waters located within the base line shall be subject to the regime of internal waters.

4. The coastal State shall give due publicity to the straight base lines.

##### E

#### Bays

1. A bay is a well-marked indentation whose penetration inland in proportion to the width of its mouth is such that its waters are *inter fauces terrae* and constitute something more than a mere curvature of the coast.

2. The line that encloses a bay shall be drawn between its natural geographical entrance points where the indentation begins to have the configuration of a bay.

3. Waters comprised within a bay shall be subject to the juridical regime of internal waters if the surface

thereof is equal to or greater than that of a semicircle drawn by using the mouth of the bay as a diameter.

4. If a bay has more than one entrance, this semicircle shall be drawn on a line as long as the sum total of the length of the different entrances. The area of the islands located within a bay shall be included in the total area of the bay.

5. So-called "historical" bays shall be subject to the regime of internal waters of the coastal State or States.

(Approved at the Fourth Plenary Session, February 3, 1956)

## ANNEX 2

DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON RESOLUTION XIII, "PRINCIPLES OF MEXICO ON THE JURIDICAL REGIME OF THE SEA"

For the reasons stated by the United States Representative during the sessions of Committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the Resolution on Territorial Waters and Related Questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its Permanent Committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

That at this Meeting of the Council of Jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the Resolution;

That the Resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the Specialized Conference called for under Resolution LXXXIV of the Tenth Inter-American Conference;

That much of the Resolution is contrary to international law;

That the Resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of States other than the adjacent coastal States in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

That the Resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of the Council of Jurists as a technical-juridical body.

In addition, the United States Delegation wishes to record the fact that when the Resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to Committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the Resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the Committee held to debate the document.

## ANNEX 3

### RESOLUTION XIV

#### SYSTEM OF TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

##### The Inter-American Council of Jurists

Suggests to the Council of the Organization of American States that it transmit to the Specialized Conference provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference the Resolution entitled "Principles of Mexico on the Juridical Regime of the Sea" approved by this Council, together with the minutes of the meetings in which this subject has been considered during the Third Meeting, with the character of the preparatory study called for in Topic I (a) of its Agenda, "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions".

(Approved at the Fourth Plenary Session, February 3, 1956)

## Export-Import Bank Loan to Brazilian Railway

A loan of \$19,625,000 to the Santos-Jundiai Railway of Brazil, for purchase of railroad equipment in the United States, was announced on January 27 by Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

American manufacturers will participate in the transaction by extending credit for \$5,375,000 to the Santos-Jundiai Railway, thereby making a total of \$25,000,000 to be spent for the U.S. railroad equipment. This will include diesel-electric locomotives, multiple-unit electric cars, centralized traffic control equipment, track materials, and shop equipment.

The Santos-Jundiai Railway, owned by the Brazilian Government, is a trunkline connecting São Paulo, the principal industrial center of Brazil, with the port of Santos, and serves as the line from Jundiai into São Paulo for the Paulista Railway. The greater part of the export products of the State of São Paulo, including coffee, have their outlet by the Santos-Jundiai. The railroad has earned substantial profits and supported high operating and maintenance standards.

The present financing by the bank will be repayable in semiannual installments over a period of 10 years, commencing in June 1958. The Export-Import Bank advanced a credit of \$8,600,000 in 1952 to the Santos-Jundiai Railway for freight cars, airbrakes, and automatic couplers and \$320,000 in 1954 for signaling equipment.

## **\$20 Million Development Aid for Bolivia**

The International Cooperation Administration on January 26 announced approval of \$20 million development assistance for Bolivia in continuation of U.S. policy to help Bolivian efforts to build a stronger, more diversified economy. The aid will be in the form of about \$14 million in U.S. foods and fibers and the remaining \$6 million in agricultural equipment, supplies, motor vehicles and parts, and iron and steel finished products.

The bulk of local currency generated from the sale of these commodities will be used for continuing joint Bolivia-U.S. economic development projects in transportation, communications, supervised agricultural credit, irrigation works, farm-to-market roads, bridge construction, road maintenance, resettlement, and health and sanitation. The commodities, supplied under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act, include wheat and wheat flour, rice, lard and vegetable oil, nonfat dry milk, and cotton.

The U.S. program of economic assistance to Bolivia began during 1953 as an emergency operation to help Bolivia avoid immediate economic crisis. World prices for tin, which accounts for 70 percent of Bolivia's foreign exchange, fell from about \$1.20 a pound in the first quarter of 1953 to about 80 cents a pound in the second quarter of that year and the resulting severe drop in foreign exchange earnings has continued.

The average production cost for tin is reported at about \$1.10 to \$1.25 a pound, compared with recent world prices of less than \$1 a pound. Bolivia has 8 percent of the world reserves of tin, accounts for about 20 percent of the free-world production output, and supplies 17 percent of United States tin.

With the dip in tin prices, Bolivia's foreign exchange earnings fell sharply. Because Bolivia had been using some \$30 million annually of foreign exchange on food imports, the country has undertaken a major program of land reclamation to increase her own agricultural production, thereby reducing her dependence on imported foodstuffs.

The \$20 million development assistance for fiscal year 1956 brings to almost \$50 million the total economic aid the United States has provided Bolivia since 1953. In addition, from 1943

through fiscal year 1956 the United States contributed about \$12.5 million toward the joint Bolivia-U.S. technical cooperation programs.

## **World Bank Reports \$13.7 Million Net Income for 6-Month Period**

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on February 6 reported a net income of \$13.7 million for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1955, compared with \$12.3 million for the corresponding period in 1954. This income was placed in the supplemental reserve against losses on loans and guaranties, and raised the reserve to \$135.2 million. Loan commissions amounted to \$7.2 million and were credited to the bank's special reserve, increasing that reserve to \$69.4 million. Total reserves on December 31, 1955, were \$204.6 million.

Gross income, exclusive of loan commissions, was \$31 million, compared with \$29.3 million in 1954. Expenses for the 6-month period totaled \$17.3 million.

The bank made 15 loans totaling \$146.3 million in Algeria, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Thailand, Union of South Africa, and Uruguay. This brought the total number of loans to 139 in 41 countries and raised the gross total of commitments to \$2,470.4 million. Disbursements on loans were \$139.2 million, bringing total disbursements to \$1,818.9 million on December 31.

Private investors participated directly in 12 of the 15 loans made since July 1. These participations, together with sales of other loans during the period, amounted to \$20.6 million. The total of participations and sales of loans amounted on December 31 to \$224.6 million, of which \$165.7 million was without the bank's guaranty.

Repayments of principal received by the bank amounted to \$12.6 million. Total principal repayments, including prepayments, amounted to \$226.5 million on December 31; this included \$152.9 million repaid to the bank, and \$73.6 million to investors who had purchased borrowers' obligations from the bank.

During the 6-month period the bank redeemed the outstanding balance of Can.\$13.6 million of the 4 percent Ten Year Bonds of 1952, due 1962, and Sw fr 2.5 million of the 2½ percent Swiss franc Serial Bonds of 1950.



## Policies of the Department of State on the Disposal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities

by Willis C. Armstrong

Deputy Director, Office of International Trade and Resources<sup>1</sup>

We in the State Department are aware that sometimes comments are made about us and agricultural disposal. Some of the notions that get around are pretty far removed from the facts. We are therefore happy to have this opportunity to show the interest and concern of the Department in the problems of agricultural exports and surplus disposal. I shall try my best to explain what we do to foster agricultural export trade and to aid in disposing of surpluses.

One point of fact must first be stated. The title of this talk contains the term "policies of the Department of State." This is not quite correct. The policy of the State Department, as of other Departments, is the President's policy, and the Department is faithful to this policy. All of the Departments and agencies of the Government work together as a team in trying to resolve the complex problems of surplus disposal. Such a process requires understanding, appreciation of the viewpoints of others, hard work, and real co-operation. All these are present, and all the people concerned with this great problem are animated by that spirit. Furthermore, concrete and effective results are being achieved.

At the risk of making some statements that are perfectly obvious to everybody in the room, I should like to begin with a brief examination of the surplus problem itself. I am sure you will agree with me that it is sometimes helpful to get back to the simple basic facts.

We all know, for example, that we have sur-

pluses because supply has raced ahead of demand. Let us remind ourselves just how it happened. For the 12 years from 1940 to 1952 there was a tremendous demand throughout the world for agricultural products, especially American products. American agriculture responded magnificently to this challenge and overcame all known production records. World War II and the war in Korea accounted for a good deal of the demand, and, in the period between, great quantities were needed to restore economies and populations to a reasonable level of nutrition and comfort.

Now another basic fact is this: In a free market situation, supply adjusts itself to demand in a process which is in some measure automatic. These adjustments can be very severe for some producers. Therefore, governments have developed programs of assistance and support. These programs have come into effect mainly in agriculture, of course, for the simple reason that it is a lot harder for an agricultural producer to adjust himself to such changes than for an industrial producer. Industrial producers can adjust production much more readily than farmers.

In recent times a new factor has arisen which makes the adjustment of supply to demand even more difficult in the United States. The great efforts to expand production were successful in large part because of the ingenuity and resourcefulness of American farmers, equipment manufacturers, and research people, which when applied to the problem greatly boosted productivity and operating efficiency on our farms. And so, when demand fell off, we found ourselves geared to a higher production per acre and loaded with a rapidly growing burden of surpluses. I know

<sup>1</sup>Address made before the Texas Federation of Cooperatives, the Texas Cooperative Ginners Association, and the Houston Bank for Cooperatives at Austin, Texas, on Feb. 7 (press release 66).

we can all agree that perfectly understandable economic events have produced the situation in which we now find ourselves.

The demand for American farm products has two parts. The domestic market accounts for 90 percent of what farmers produce. Domestic demand has not fallen since 1952. Instead, it has grown with our population and has been stimulated further by the high level of industrial prosperity of the past several years. Assuming that this level of prosperity continues, we can reasonably count on a sustained domestic demand for our farm products. In this connection, I would urge that you examine the recent economic report of the President to the Congress, dated January 24.<sup>2</sup> It contains an excellent account of the state of our economy today and is a most encouraging and heartening report.

#### **Decline in Foreign Demand**

This is not the case, however, with the other part of our demand. Other countries have been making good economic progress, but their demand for our farm products has not kept pace with this progress. In fact it has been declining since 1952, and for perfectly understandable reasons.

The first reason is that foreign agricultural output, starting in many areas from a devastated condition in 1945, began to catch up with local demand. Why was this? Partly, it was due to the normal revival in devastated areas. Partly, it grew out of the fact that almost every country was very short of gold and dollars, and of foreign currencies in general, during the period after the war. A country in such circumstances will very logically try to produce at home the things it would normally buy abroad, even though the local cost might be higher than the price of goods bought with scarce foreign exchange. Indeed, some of these countries were traditionally agricultural exporters; they too were short of foreign exchange and needed money for imports of all kinds. What would be more logical than for them to expand their output of things in which they already specialized, with the hope of earning more foreign exchange to take care of their import needs?

This brings us to a second reason for the decline

<sup>2</sup>For excerpts from the President's economic report, see BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 253.

in foreign demand for our farm products. Our system of pricing agricultural products has served as an incentive to other exporting countries, which have often captured markets as a result. Thus, our own inducements to farmers to expand output when demand was high made our prices less competitive when farm output in the rest of the world increased and total world market demand became satisfied.

Furthermore, countries which are traditional importers, having encouraged high-cost domestic production of agricultural goods so as to save foreign exchange, found themselves under pressure to protect their own farmers by limiting their imports.

This admittedly oversimplified analysis of the problem shows that our highly efficient and productive farms have been faced with a serious decline in one part of their market. Much of the burden of adjustment of supply to demand in world agricultural markets has fallen on the United States, with consequences which are all too familiar to everyone in this room.

Suppose we now turn to consider what is being done and what can be done to enable the United States to meet this problem through exports. First and foremost, we wish to retain our commercial markets abroad. These markets are the base upon which we must build to achieve the kind of situation we want.

By commercial markets, I mean those markets where we are competitive and where we get paid in dollars. We much prefer this kind of market to one we get from making great concessions on price and payments. Our long-run goal must be the expansion of our markets on a sound economic basis so that we are not continually faced with the need for so much Government action in the process of adjustment of supply to demand; we also must avoid the kind of consequences for farm income which the country experienced in earlier times of crisis and adjustment.

#### **President's International Trade Policy**

One of the continuing strengths of our agricultural export policy is the general international trade policy laid down by the President. The President's foreign economic program, placed before the Congress in 1954, based on the report of a distinguished commission headed by Clarence Randall, calls for a reduction or elimination of

barriers to trade.<sup>3</sup> For purposes of discussion, we may divide these barriers into two groups: the first, the barriers created or maintained by other countries against our exports. Whether they are tariffs, exchange controls, internal subsidies, or quotas, we have steadily pressed other countries to reduce or eliminate these barriers, and with success.

In this struggle against the protectionism of other countries, we have two kinds of leverage. One is the demand of people in other countries for our products because they may be cheaper or better than domestic ones. The other kind of leverage is directly related to a discussion of the other kind of barrier. If we can offer other countries a reduction in our barriers, we can expect them to reciprocate. If they can sell more of the products in which they specialize, they can buy more of our goods.

Consequently, the President's program included a request for new legislation to extend the Trade Agreements Act and to enable the United States to make further moderate reductions in tariffs in exchange for concessions made by other countries. This legislation was adopted last June. The President is now authorized to reduce tariff rates by 5 percent each year for 3 years, or, if a rate is above 50 percent, he may reduce it to that level. Negotiations in accordance with this law are now going on in Geneva with a substantial group of countries, and the United States is asking in these negotiations for a reduction of trade barriers which impede the export of our farm products.<sup>4</sup>

#### General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

In order to make trade agreement concessions more effective, we have merged most of our trade agreements into one large one called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT. This agreement is a list of agreed tariff concessions and a set of common principles for international trade. One of the chief purposes of the agreed principles is to prevent countries from using some device other than the tariff to defeat tariff concessions. In the development of these principles, full

recognition has been given to the special interests of American agriculture in international trade.

In order for the general agreement to be more effective and so that the United States can use it better, the President is advocating that the United States join a proposed international organization to administer it. This would be called the Organization for Trade Cooperation, or Orc.<sup>5</sup> It is a very simple thing. Countries which participate in the general agreement will all belong to it. It will have no authority to impose any obligation on any country. The United States would not give up any of its sovereignty to belong. The Orc would, however, provide a forum in which we could more promptly obtain compliance with the rules of the general agreement. The President has asked the Congress to approve U.S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This step is an important part of the President's program and an important event in the history of international trade.

The general agreement and Orc are related to our agricultural problems because they serve the need for building a sound structure of international trade in which we can sell our goods in expanding markets over a long period in the future. The general agreement and the Orc are thus an investment in the long-term future of American farm exports. They are not designed to solve problems of accumulated surpluses.

To deal with surpluses, special programs have been devised. Let us now move on to examine these programs.

The first of these is section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1955, which requires that \$300 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities be included in the foreign aid extended during the current fiscal year. This program is administered by the International Cooperation Administration, now a part of the Department of State. The officers of that Administration are vigorously pursuing this program and are seeking to place these surpluses where they will do the most good. This \$300 million worth of aid is useful directly to friendly and allied countries. It is over and above the amounts that would be sold if there were no such aid. When countries receive these goods, they put up their own money in amounts equivalent

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 19, 1954, p. 602. For the report of the Randall Commission, see *ibid.*, Feb. 8, 1954, p. 187.

<sup>4</sup> For a statement at the Geneva negotiations by Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, see *ibid.*, Jan. 30, 1956, p. 184.

<sup>5</sup> For the President's message to Congress on Orc, see *ibid.*, Apr. 25, 1955, p. 678; for the text of the Orc agreement, see *ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1955, p. 579.

to the value of the goods, and this money can be used for other desirable purposes.<sup>6</sup>

#### Public Law 480

The second important special export program is that provided under title I of Public Law 480, called the "Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954," which was passed by the preceding Congress and amended by the present Congress. Title I enables the Government to sell up to \$1,500,000,000 worth of agricultural surplus commodities to foreign governments in exchange for local currency. The local currency is used to pay United States Government expenses in the other country, to promote the common defense, to provide for international educational exchange, to acquire strategic materials for our stockpile, and to develop new market opportunities for American products. It may also be used as a loan to the local government for the kind of economic development and trade projects which should help our future export trade.

This title I program began in September 1954, and as of now agreements have been concluded with 22 countries, covering \$769 million worth of goods. At the moment, we are negotiating several other agreements; total agreements reached by June 30, 1956, should cover \$1,200,000,000 worth of farm products. The Department of State has primary responsibility for negotiating these agreements with other countries. The Department of Agriculture is responsible under the law for determining the countries and the quantities and the types of commodities.

Title II of Public Law 480 enables the Government to give away up to \$300 million worth of agricultural surpluses when flood, famine, or disaster overtake other countries. So far, nearly half of this authority has been used. This part of Public Law 480 is administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

Title III of Public Law 480, administered by the Department of Agriculture, provides for donations to international organizations or to American private charitable institutions operating abroad. Thus far, \$126 million worth of goods—

all dairy products—have been provided for the needy in other countries through these channels. The list of products available for such purposes has recently been expanded to include wheat, corn, rice, and dry beans.

In addition, title III authorizes the barter of our surpluses for strategic materials, and more than \$300 million worth of goods has been bartered during the past 2 years.<sup>7</sup> Many of these contracts run well into the future. Furthermore, the President's new farm program, placed before the Congress on January 9, calls for increased barter activities through which we can exchange our perishables for nonperishables for use in the case of emergency. The goods received are placed in a stockpile and carefully insulated from the domestic market, so as to insure an incentive for foreign countries to produce goods without interfering with their normal sales in commercial markets.

Now let us get back to title I of Public Law 480 and the international agreements negotiated under that title.

On September 9, 1954, the President issued an Executive order specifying the way in which Public Law 480 was to be administered.<sup>8</sup> The President assigned to the Secretary of State the responsibility for negotiating and entering into agreements under this title of the act. These agreements are usually negotiated abroad, with the Ambassador or Chief of Mission in charge of the negotiations on the United States side. He is supported and aided by officers of the International Cooperation Administration mission and the agricultural attaché. He operates on instructions from the Department of State, which have been agreed to by the other agencies of the Government. Each negotiation involves questions such as how the local currencies are to be used, what exchange rates will govern, the mechanics of shipping, and other transfer arrangements. Each agreement needs the advice of lawyers, financial experts, and commodity and shipping experts; and each agreement requires the talent of good negotiators.

As I indicated above, many agreements have

<sup>6</sup> For a chart on surplus agricultural commodities sold by the Foreign Operations Administration in fiscal years 1954 and 1955, see *ibid.*, July 4, 1955, p. 30. For an excerpt from the eighth semiannual report to Congress on the mutual security program, see *ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1955, p. 428.

<sup>7</sup> For a memorandum from J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, to Gerald D. Morgan, Special Counsel to the President, on the barter authority under Public Law 480, see *ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1955, p. 569.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Oct. 4, 1954, p. 498.



been negotiated and a substantial number of additional ones are in process. In some cases where we have tried to negotiate agreements, we have not succeeded. In some cases we have not even been able, for good reason, to get the negotiations under way.

In general, however, all our agreements accomplish two things: They help the foreign country to get needed commodities on advantageous terms, and they move American farm surpluses into consumption.

Care must be taken not to damage our own country's markets by displacing cash sales with Public Law 480 sales, and care must also be exercised to see that our transactions do not unduly disrupt world markets. On all counts, and with full regard for specific provisions of the law and the President's policy in administering it, we have reason to be proud of our achievements. A total of approximately two and a half million tons in goods had been shipped under title I by the end of 1955.

Every 6 months the President reports to the Congress on the operation of Public Law 480. The most recent report is House of Representatives Document 294.<sup>9</sup> In it you will find the facts on commodities, amounts, and methods of operation.

#### **Delegation of Functions**

Now, as I have said, the President's Executive order of September 9, 1954, delegated to the Secretary of State the responsibility for negotiating and entering into agreements. It stated further that "All functions under the Act, however vested, delegated, or assigned, shall be subject to the responsibilities of the Secretary of State with respect to the foreign policy of the United States as such policy relates to the said functions." The President's accompanying letter to the various agencies pointed out that this delegation of authority was "intended to give recognition to the State Department's central responsibility in this area"—that is, in the area of foreign relations and policy.

In addition to the delegation of functions to the specific agencies of the Government, such as the Departments of Agriculture and State, the Executive order provided for the establishment of an interagency committee, headed by a representative of the White House, to coordinate policies. The

Secretary of Agriculture was given the task of coordinating all operations. The transmittal letter of the President to the Congress which accompanies his most recent report on the operation of Public Law 480 states that these administrative arrangements "continue to function satisfactorily" and "have proved effective" in accomplishing the purpose of the law.

Regardless of whether exports are commercial, or handled under economic aid or Public Law 480, it is important that they be competitive in price. The Commodity Credit Corporation has the authority, and uses it, to make exports of commodities acquired through price support operations competitive in foreign markets. This is at the base of cash sales, aid, and Public Law 480, because it determines the price paid by the individual importer in the receiving country, regardless of the method of financing. Without the use of the authority, our sales would be far smaller than they are.

This authority must be used wisely and with scrupulous care because it is a matter of a Government decision on prices, in competition with private business, or government, in other countries. Unsound operations along these lines could lead to price wars and cutthroat competition of the type which helps no one. We define this as a matter of making our exports competitive. Many people in other countries say that, if we are selling abroad at a lower price than we are at home, we are subsidizing our exports. When other countries do this in our market, we sometimes call it "dumping" and apply additional tariffs.

Thus, there are international problems connected with action by the Government to sell products competitively with other producers. It has been necessary to engage in a great deal of international discussion to explain that prices resulting from our support operations were not intended to be an umbrella over other producers in other countries, and that we do not intend to use the export subsidy device to acquire more than our fair share of the world market. Now and then there may be a difference of opinion as to what constitutes a fair share, but a measure of tolerant understanding on the part of other countries can be achieved under conditions of moderation.

There are other means available to the Government to aid our export trade in agricultural products. The Export-Import Bank has on many

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 23, 1956, p. 130.

occasions financed exports, and the Commodity Credit Corporation may also extend credit to encourage agricultural shipments.

In terms of competitiveness, it is important that our products appeal to consumers on grounds of quality and conformity to specifications. I understand that the Department of Agriculture has under way a program to encourage the adoption of better quality standards and a measure of better conformity to them in respect to many of our agricultural commodities.

#### Basic Policies

We have reviewed the various means the Government is using to help move our surpluses abroad. Let us now return to the basic policy which guides the Government in its action. The policy of the President has been set forth at various times, on various occasions, but the major policy statement was issued at the time the President signed the Executive order which I have already mentioned regarding the administration of Public Law 480.

The first point in this policy statement was that the general foreign economic policy contained in the President's message to Congress of March 30, 1954, based on the Randall Commission report, was applicable to agriculture and that farm policies should be consistent with that policy.

The statement went on to indicate that prices of many of our farm products were not competitive and that production was out of balance with demand. The statement further indicated that the magnitude of the United States holdings of many commodities was "such as to be capable of demoralizing world commodity markets should a policy of reckless selling abroad be pursued." Then came this sentence: "The United States cannot accept the role of limiting its sales in world markets until other countries have disposed of their production." The answer has to be found in expanding consumption abroad through greater purchasing power, better distribution, and marketing. The statement promised orderly and gradual reduction of United States surpluses. It also said that the United States "will offer its products at competitive prices" but will not use its surpluses "to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodities."

The statement went on to say that the United States would use its surpluses, in cooperation with

other countries, to increase consumption in areas where there is underconsumption and where there are practical opportunities for increasing the use of food and fiber in a manner designed to stimulate economic development in friendly countries and to enhance their security position.

The most recent indication of the policies of the President in respect to the disposal of our surpluses abroad is to be found on page 58 of the economic report of the President transmitted to the Congress on January 24. This statement reads as follows:

The Administration is intensifying its efforts in these directions [i.e., increased disposals and competitive sales]. Yet experience shows that there are limits to expanding the noncommercial disposal of farm products. Beyond some point, commercial sales are merely displaced, without increasing total consumption. At home, the displacement may be of the same or competing commodities; abroad, our own commercial exports or those of friendly nations may be displaced. Moreover, domestic producers in an importing country, even if its people are ill-fed and ill-clothed, may feel adversely affected. The difficulties are greatest with our large surpluses, those of cotton and wheat. Extreme care is necessary to avoid disrupting world markets and damaging the delicate fabric of our foreign relations.

We must remember that, regardless of what any one of us might wish, our ability to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities is limited by certain specific and identifiable phenomena.

We cannot sell our goods for dollars if people do not have the dollars, or if they prefer to spend the dollars they have for products other than agricultural ones.

We cannot barter our surpluses unless other countries are prepared to make available the kind of goods we want for stockpiling.

There is a limit to the extent to which we can dispose of goods as a part of our aid programs within the purposes of the mutual security legislation.

If we sell for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, title I, without regard to our usual marketings, we may simply displace our commercial exports with exports of a less commercial character. Furthermore, excessive disposal under title I can unduly disrupt world markets and run counter to our national interests and our national security. This is not merely something the Department of State is concerned about; it is something the whole Government and the whole country have to be concerned about, for the world has become much smaller and everyone is now our neighbor.

SI  
of su  
the e  
calat  
mor  
I  
stud  
alrea  
prob  
selve  
agre  
of th  
affec  
it is  
dom  
ours  
  
Surp  
I  
tions  
poli  
In  
agri  
secti  
asset  
poor  
tries  
their  
frien  
nom  
to in  
judic  
In  
surp  
pose  
kets.  
tries  
prob  
duct  
relat  
auth  
In  
econ  
tain  
a big  
derd  
real  
peri  
mar  
Law  
deve  
play

Shipments of commodities donated for the relief of suffering or in the event of famine are limited by the extent to which other countries are visited by calamities, and we can scarcely wish that they have more of them.

I think you will find that everyone who has studied this problem has concluded that there are already limits on our ability to solve our surplus problems by exports if our objective is to do ourselves more good than harm. I am sure you will agree that it would be inappropriate for an officer of the State Department to expound on matters affecting domestic agricultural policy, but I think it is reasonable to recognize the implications for domestic policy in the situation in which we find ourselves.

### **Surplus Disposal and Foreign Policy**

I shall try to give you an evaluation of the relationship of our surplus disposal to our foreign policy and foreign relations.

In the first place, our authority to dispose of agricultural goods under Public Law 480 or under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act is a real asset in our foreign relations. Many countries are poor; many countries have crop failures; all countries wish to expand the level of consumption of their populations; many countries politically very friendly to the United States are in serious economic difficulties. In these cases we can do much to improve our relations with these countries by judicious use of our surpluses.

In the field of barter, we can obtain through our surpluses goods we may need for security purposes and which might otherwise be lacking markets. These goods may be the product of industries in other countries which otherwise have a problem of unemployment. Employment, production, surplus disposal, and improved foreign relations can result from the use of the barter authority.

In the countries which are not experiencing economic difficulties, and where we wish to maintain our cash sales, it is not reasonable to expect a big outlet for our surpluses, but in certain underdeveloped areas we can use our surpluses as a real investment in the future welfare and prosperity of the country and thus create an improved market for our own commercial exports. Public Law 480 enables us to make loans for economic development purposes and a better level of employment and purchasing power. In this way, we

can also demonstrate our genuine interest in the development and progress of these countries.

In the second place, there is another side of the coin. Reckless or excessive disposal of surpluses can injure countries which make their living by selling the same goods and which cannot afford to dispose of them on the terms we are in a position to offer. Many of these countries are among our best political friends. If we hurt our friends, we hurt ourselves. This is just as true in international affairs as it is in human relations. Furthermore, the American people have made a tremendous investment, in the past 10 years or so, in the economic health of the free world. This investment was made as a matter of our own national interest, and it would be foolish to impair it.

If we start a downward spiral in world agricultural prices, we also tend to eliminate our own cash export business in the process and encourage by example other countries to adopt policies which in the end will hurt our exports.

Let us not forget that the Communist movement is watching us very closely, ready to seize an opportunity to advance its interests at our expense. Recently we have seen the U. S. S. R. launching an apparently new international economic policy. It has offered loans, grants, technical assistance, and trade to many countries.

Often these are countries which would be especially vulnerable to "all-out" disposal efforts by the United States. For example, Burma lives by selling rice, and the Russians have offered to buy whatever Burma has in surplus; a rash policy of United States rice disposal in Asia could very well push Burma, against its will, into the arms of the Communist imperialists. Much the same can be said of Egypt and cotton. Thus, in a period of nuclear-weapon standoff, the Communist economic offensive may be the chief means by which the U. S. S. R. tries to convert our allies into neutrals, and to enshroud neutrals in an iron or bamboo curtain.

We therefore must be careful, in our disposal policy, not to manufacture political ammunition for the Communists. In the struggle between international communism and freedom, we are working to make the free world strong, not to play into the Communists' hands. The U.S.S.R. is a dictatorship which can be highly flexible and ingenious in the development of its policies and actions. We want no part of *that* kind of flexibility, but we can't ignore its existence. It behooves



us to combat the efforts of communism by a demonstration of the superiority of the democratic way of life. Moderation and a proper concern for the interests of others are the earmarks of a democratic approach. Incidentally, these are also the earmarks of good business.

In closing, I should like to say a few words more about cotton. In many respects the disposal of our cotton surplus presents the most serious problems of all—in terms of competitiveness, foreign policy, and the domestic economy. I have been much impressed by reading a study put out by the staff of the National Cotton Council called *Price and the Future of United States Cotton*. It seems to me that this serious and penetrating study sheds a great deal of light on the cotton problem.

We all know that our cotton has not been competitive in foreign markets this past year. There is a question whether drastic price reductions will in fact make it competitive. Part of the competition with United States cotton comes from other cotton-producing countries, many of which are important to us in our international relations. Much competition comes from rayon staple fiber, both domestic and foreign. If it were easy to devise a national program which would make an inroad on our surplus without damaging our friends abroad or injuring our domestic industry, this would have been done some time ago. The search for a rational solution is certainly under way, and I am hopeful that it will be rewarding in terms of the national interest of the United States.

Our general surplus problem is a tough one. The United States has made considerable progress in attacking it, with the cooperation of farmers, businessmen, the Congress, and the various agencies of the executive branch of the Government. There is much more to do and there are many conflicting interests and extremely difficult questions, all of which must be taken into account in the democratic process of arriving at a reasonable solution.

## Agricultural Agreement With Burma

Press release 70 dated February 8

An agricultural commodities agreement was concluded at Rangoon on February 8 between the Government of the Union of Burma and the Government of the United States of America.

U. Raschid, Minister for Trade Development, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of the Union of Burma, and Ambassador Joseph C. Satterthwaite on behalf of the Government of the United States of America.

Under this agreement, the Government of the Union of Burma will purchase and the Government of the United States of America agrees to sell approximately \$20.8 million (kyat 98 millions) worth of the following surplus agricultural commodities: raw cotton, \$17.5 million; dairy products, \$2.0 million; tobacco, \$1.1 million; fruit, \$0.2 million; total commodity value, \$20.8 million. Transportation costs of \$0.9 million are also included in the agreement. All payments for these commodities will be made in Burmese currency.

Negotiations for this agreement were initiated in Washington with informal discussions early in September 1955. The agreement will enable Burma to increase the import of consumer goods without expenditure of dollar or other foreign exchange. At the same time it will permit the United States to make available to Burma agricultural products which at the moment are surplus in the United States.

## P. L. 480 Agreement With Austria

Press release 67 dated February 7

The Department of State announced on February 7 that an agreement for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities has been concluded between the United States and the Government of Austria. The agreement was negotiated under the authority of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). It was signed at Vienna on February 7 by the Chancellor of Austria, Dr. Julius Raab, and the American Chargé d'Affaires, James K. Penfield.

Under the agreement approximately \$22.3 million worth of U.S. agricultural commodities will be sold to Austrian importers for schillings. Sales under this program will be made by U.S. traders. Commodity details of the program are being announced by the Department of Agriculture.<sup>1</sup>

In announcing the agreement, U.S. officials stated that this was the second such agreement with the Austrian Government. The previous agreement, signed on June 14, 1955, provided for financing purchases of corn, tobacco, and cotton



having a U.S. market value of approximately \$6 million including certain ocean transportation costs.

It was also emphasized that a substantial portion of the schillings accruing from sales under the new program would be made available to the Government of Austria in the form of long-term loans for economic development purposes. This program will also enable Austria to increase consumer imports without expenditure of additional dollar or other foreign exchange holdings during the period when the very real economic burdens imposed on Austria under the terms of the State Treaty, particularly the payments to the Soviets, have their greatest adverse impact on Austrian foreign exchange resources.

## AEC Regulation Concerning Foreign Atomic Energy Activity

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, on January 20 announced issuance of a regulation to help U.S. citizens conduct atomic energy business abroad.<sup>2</sup>

Entitled "Unclassified Activities in Foreign Atomic Energy Programs," the regulation is effective immediately and formalizes action taken by the Commission as announced on October 3, 1955.<sup>3</sup>

The regulation generally authorizes, without advance Commission approval, unclassified foreign atomic energy activity by U.S. firms and individuals in countries not members of the Soviet bloc. It includes a reporting requirement covering specified activities engaged in by Americans abroad.

The general authorization does not relieve any person from compliance with license requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

A procedure is set up for filing applications for

specific Commission approval of activities not generally authorized by the regulation and not covered in international agreements for cooperation to which the United States is a party.

Reports required by the regulation are to be made within 30 days of the start of the activity. (Persons who have already engaged in activity required to be reported have until February 19 to submit reports.) Activities which must be reported include design, construction, or operation outside the United States of nuclear reactors and certain other facilities; the design or fabrication of component parts specially designed or fabricated for these facilities; and the furnishing of designs, drawings, or other technical data for use in the construction or operation of the facilities or component parts. Reports are also required when U.S. citizens engage, outside the United States, in the separation of the isotopes of uranium, plutonium, or thorium; the production of heavy water, zirconium (hafnium-free or low-hafnium content), reactor grade graphite, or beryllium; or in the processing, fabricating, or alloying of special nuclear material.

No reporting is required covering normal sales promotion activity. Specifically excluded from the reporting requirement are activities consisting only of (1) communicating information generally available to the public in published form; (2) giving financial assistance; (3) transmitting information relating only to conceptual designs or performance characteristics of reactors or facilities; (4) giving comparative evaluations of types of reactors or facilities; or (5) combinations of these activities. Neither do activities specifically authorized by the Commission need to be reported.

The general authorization, which has been effective since its announcement on October 3, 1955, is based on Section 57a(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The section makes it unlawful for any person to engage directly or indirectly in the production of any special nuclear material outside the United States except:

(a) Under an agreement for cooperation made with a foreign nation, or

(b) Upon Commission authorization after it has determined that the activity will not be inimical to the interest of the United States.

The general authorization is issued under (b). Its effect is to eliminate the need for individual Commission authorizations in advance for many

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Agriculture on Feb. 7 announced that the commodity composition of the program is as follows:

	Million dollars
Wheat (approximately 2 million bushels) . . . .	3.4
Corn (approximately 4 million bushels) . . . .	6.1
Cotton (approximately 30,000 bales) . . . . .	5.6
Tobacco (approximately 5 million pounds) . . . .	3.0
Lard (approximately 15 million pounds) . . . . .	2.4
Fruit . . . . .	.3
Ocean transportation (estimated) . . . . .	1.5
Total . . . . .	22.3

<sup>2</sup> For text, see 21 Fed. Reg. 418.

<sup>3</sup> 20 Fed. Reg. 7399.

activities. The action, consistent with the U.S. national policy of encouraging peaceful uses of atomic energy at home and abroad, is designed to help American companies and citizens doing business in foreign markets.

The reporting requirements of the regulation will keep the Commission informed of significant activities under the general authorization.

## **U.S. Contributes \$6 Million to U.N. Technical Assistance**

U.S./U.N. press release 2346 dated January 31

A United States contribution of \$6,000,000 was made on January 31 by the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to the United Nations Technical Assistance Program. This is the first contribution by the United States on its 1956 pledge of \$15,500,000.

The U.S. pledge for the current year is \$500,000 more than the 1955 pledge. It is subject to the limitation that the United States shall not exceed 50 percent of the total contributed by all governments.

## **Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography**

### **Security Council**

Report dated 15 December 1955 by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the Lake Tiberias incident of the night of 11-12 December 1955. S/3516, December 20, 1955. 15 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 21 December 1955 from the Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3518, December 22, 1955. 11 pp. mimeo.

Report dated 15 December 1955 by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the Lake Tiberias incident of the night of 11-12 December 1955. Supplement dated 30 December 1955. S/3516/Add. 1, December 30, 1955. 4 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 29 December 1955 from the Representative of Israel addressed to the Secretary-General. S/3524, December 30, 1955. 9 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 9 January 1956 from the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3529, January 10, 1956. 2 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 20 January 1956 from the Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3539, January 20, 1956. 4 pp. mimeo.

### **General Assembly**

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: Summary and analysis of information transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter. Report of the Secretary-General. General information. Human Rights in Territories under United Kingdom Administration. A/3105, December 21, 1955. 4 pp. mimeo.

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: Summary and analysis of information transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter. Report of the Secretary-General. Southern African Territories. A/3106, December 22, 1955. 54 pp. mimeo.

Corrigendum No. 1 to the UNREF Progress Report for 1955. A/AC.79/23/Corr.1, December 22, 1955. 1 p. mimeo.

### **Economic and Social Council**

Work of the Council in 1956. Draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General. E/L.688, November 10, 1955. 15 pp. mimeo.

Provisional Agenda for the Tenth Session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Note by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/272, December 9, 1955. 7 pp. mimeo.

Technical Assistance. Report of the Technical Assistance Committee. E/2810, December 12, 1955. 12 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Activities of the Secretariat in the Field of Flood Control and Water Resources Development. E/CN.11/414, December 12, 1955. 13 pp. mimeo.

Social Welfare Services to Migrants Provided by Non-Governmental Organizations. E/CN.5/NGO/44, December 19, 1955. 67 pp. mimeo.

Commission on Human Rights. Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Memorandum on the Principal Activities of UNESCO in the Field of Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities since the Seventh Session of the Sub-Commission. E/CN.4/Sub.2/174, December 28, 1955. 6 pp. mimeo.

Request for an advisory opinion to the International Court of Justice, submitted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. E/2817, January 11, 1956. 3 pp. mimeo.

Convention on Road Traffic adopted at the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport (Geneva, September 19, 1949). Note by the Secretary-General. E/2818, January 12, 1956. 4 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Nationality of Married Women (Memorandum by the Secretary-General). E/CN.6/254/Add.1, January 13, 1956. 7 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Activities Directed Toward the Recognition and Exercise of Political Rights of Women (Report by the Secretary-General). E/CN.6/275, January 13, 1956. 9 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Equal Pay for Equal Work. Methods used in Campaigns for Equal Pay for Equal Work and Information on the Present Status of the Application of the Principle in various countries (Report by the Secretary-General). E/CN.6/276, January 16, 1956. 46 pp. mimeo.

World Calendar Reform. Replies received from Governments [Belgium, Denmark, Iran, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Syria]. E/2812/Rev.1, January 18, 1956. 6 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Property Rights of Women. Supplementary Report by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/208/Add.3, January 18, 1956. 24 pp. mimeo.

## International Plant Protection Convention Transmitted to Senate

S. Exec. D, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

### PRESIDENT'S TRANSMITTAL MESSAGE

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1956.*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Plant Protection Convention, which was open for signature at Rome from December 6, 1951, to May 1, 1952, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and 36 other states.

The purposes of the convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
*Washington, October 21, 1955.*

THE PRESIDENT,  
*The White House:*

I have the honor to transmit to you, with the recommendation that it be sent to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, a certified copy of the International Plant Protection Convention, which was open for signature at Rome from December 6, 1951, to May 1, 1952, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and 36 other states.

The convention is designed to provide for international cooperation in controlling pests and diseases of plants and plant products and in preventing their introduction and spread across international boundaries. It outlines the policies under which import restrictions for phytosanitary reasons can be justified, describes the type of national organization for plant protection that each government should provide to the best of its

ability, recognizes the advantage of regional organizations under which governments having similar interests can participate to improve pest and disease control, and prescribes a standard form for phytosanitary certificates. A summary of its provisions accompanies this report.

In the United States the determination of quarantine action with respect to the importation of plants is a responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Plant Quarantine Act of 1912 (37 Stat. 315), as amended. The present convention does not disturb this responsibility. Under it the parties agree to maintain adequate pest control and regulatory organizations and to issue export certificates only under the authority of technically qualified officers. The convention does not attempt to take over any of the responsibilities of individual governments for final decision on needed plant-quarantine measures, nor require that the judgment of the contracting governments be superseded by decisions of an international body.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture participated in 1950 and 1951 in the negotiations for the formulation of the convention, and that Department desires that the United States become a party thereto. It is the belief of the Department of Agriculture that the convention will be helpful in the control of insect and plant disease outbreaks throughout the world and in preventing the spread of such diseases from one country to another. It will be the means of bringing about a better understanding of mutual plant protection problems and should at the same time afford an opportunity for study of the biological basis of existing or proposed plant-quarantine restrictions. Further, it is felt that under the provisions of the convention and under the leadership of the Food and Agriculture Organization continued improvement in the dependability and competence of the pest-control organizations of the contracting governments throughout the world can be expected.

During the period of formulation of the convention, representatives of the Department of Agriculture were in consultation with the various State plant quarantine officers of this country and discussed the provisions of the proposed convention at meetings of the four regional plant boards into which the plant-quarantine officers of the 48 States are organized. The convention in its final form was endorsed by the National Plant Board of the United States, comprised of representatives of the four regional boards, at its annual meeting held in Washington, October 17-18, 1951.

The convention, in accordance with article XIV, came into force on April 3, 1952. It is now in force with respect to 29 countries which have completed the ratification or adherence procedure. They are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Laos, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Yugoslavia.

This document is considered by the Departments of State and Agriculture to be an important and constructive convention, and it is believed it will be useful in providing a forum for discussion of problems involving the control and prevention of the international spread of pests and diseases of plants. It will not require any increase in appropriations for agricultural or quarantine work, since it does not change present United States policies. It is hoped, therefore, that the Senate will give the convention favorable consideration. Support and ratification of the convention will be advantageous to American agriculture and will help to promote the health of agricultural industry throughout the world.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

#### Summary of the Provisions of the International Plant Protection Convention

*Article I* states that the purpose of the convention is that of securing common and effective action to prevent the introduction and spread of pests and diseases of plants and plant products and to promote measures for their control.

*Article II* defines the terms "plants" and "plant products" and extends the scope of the convention to cover facilities for storage and transportation of such products.

*Article III* authorizes supplementary detailed agree-

ments which would become applicable to the signatories of such agreements after acceptance.

*Article IV* requires that each contracting government shall to the best of its ability make provision for (1) a competent official plant protection organization, (2) distribution of information within the country regarding pests and diseases of plants, and (3) research and investigation in the field of plant protection.

*Article V* provides that the contracting governments shall issue phytosanitary certificates only under conditions that make such certificates dependable documents.

*Article VI* provides for the establishment of necessary quarantines by contracting governments which agree to limit such quarantines to those made necessary by phytosanitary considerations.

*Article VII* provides for international cooperation in reporting the occurrence, outbreak, and spread of economically important pests and diseases, and for the participation of contracting governments in appropriate international action when necessary to meet emergencies.

*Article VIII* provides for the establishment of regional plant protection organizations of which several have already been formed or are in the process of organization. It is not contemplated that it will be necessary to form a North American regional plant-protection organization in view of the fact that only Canada, Mexico, and the United States would be involved and that cooperation between the United States and those countries is being maintained continuously on a bilateral basis.

*Article IX* outlines a procedure for the settlement of disputes that may arise out of the operation of the convention. If a contracting government considers that any action by another contracting government is in conflict with the obligations under the convention, the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization appoints a committee of experts who consider the question in dispute. The contracting governments agree that the recommendations of such a committee, while not binding in character, will become the basis for renewed consideration by the governments concerned of the matter out of which the disagreement arose.

*Article X* provides for termination and replacement of certain prior conventions.

*Articles XI, XII, XIII, XIV, and XV* include formal provisions relating to the extent to which the convention is applicable to dependent territories and prescribe procedures for ratification, adherence, amendment, entry into force, and denunciation of the convention. Amendments involving new obligations come into force for each contracting government only on acceptance by it. Denunciation takes effect one year from the date of receipt of the notification by the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

#### TEXT OF INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

##### PREAMBLE

The contracting Governments, recognizing the usefulness of international co-operation in controlling pests and diseases of plants and plant products and in preventing



their introduction and spread across national boundaries, and desiring to ensure close co-ordination of measures directed to these ends, have agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE I—PURPOSE AND RESPONSIBILITY

1. With the purpose of securing common and effective action to prevent the introduction and spread of pests and diseases of plants and plant products and to promote measures for their control, the contracting Governments undertake to adopt the legislative, technical and administrative measures specified in this Convention and in supplementary agreements pursuant to Article III.

2. Each contracting Government shall assume responsibility for the fulfillment within its territories of all requirements under this Convention.

#### ARTICLE II—SCOPE

1. For the purposes of this Convention the term "plants" shall comprise living plants and parts thereof, including seeds in so far as the supervision of their importation under Article VI of the Convention or the issue of phytosanitary certificates in respect of them under Articles IV (1), (a), (iv) and V of this Convention may be deemed necessary by contracting Governments; and the term "plant products" shall comprise unmanufactured and milled material of plant origin, including seeds in so far as they are not included in the term "plants."

2. The provisions of this Convention may be deemed by contracting Governments to extend to storage places, containers, conveyances, packing material and accompanying media of all sorts including soil involved in the international transportation of plants and plant products.

3. This Convention shall have particular reference to pests and diseases of importance to international trade.

#### ARTICLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS

1. Supplementary agreements applicable to specific regions, to specific pests or diseases, to specific plants and plant products, to specific methods of international transportation of plants and plant products, or otherwise supplementing the provisions of this Convention, may be proposed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as "FAO") on the recommendation of a contracting Government or on its own initiative, to meet special problems of plant protection which need particular attention or action.

2. Any such supplementary agreements shall come into force for each contracting Government after acceptance in accordance with the provisions of the FAO Constitution and Rules of Procedure.

#### ARTICLE IV—NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PLANT PROTECTION

1. Each contracting Government shall make provision, as soon as possible and to the best of its ability, for

(a) an official plant protection organization, with the following main functions:

(i) the inspection of growing plants, of areas under cultivation (including fields, plantations, nurseries, gardens and greenhouses), and of plants and plant products in storage and in transportation, particularly with the object of reporting the existence, outbreak and spread of plant diseases and pests and of controlling those pests and diseases;

(ii) the inspection of consignments of plants and plant products moving in international traffic, and, as far as practicable, the inspection of consignments of other articles or commodities moving in international traffic under conditions where they may act incidentally as carriers of pests and diseases of plants and plant products, and the inspection and supervision of storage and transportation facilities of all kinds involved in international traffic whether of plants and plant products or of other commodities, particularly with the object of preventing the dissemination across national boundaries of pests and diseases of plants and plant products;

(iii) the disinfection or disinfestation of consignments of plants and plant products moving in international traffic, and their containers, storage places, or transportation facilities of all kinds employed;

(iv) the issue of certificates relating to phytosanitary condition and origin of consignments of plants and plant products (hereinafter referred to as "phytosanitary certificates");

(b) the distribution of information within the country regarding the pests and diseases of plants and plant products and the means of their prevention and control;

(c) research and investigation in the field of plant protection.

2. Each contracting Government shall submit a description of the scope of its national organization for plant protection and of changes in such organization to the Director-General of FAO, who shall circulate such information to all contracting Governments.

#### ARTICLE V—PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATES

1. Each contracting Government shall make arrangements for the issue of phytosanitary certificates to accord with the plant protection regulations of other contracting Governments, and in conformity with the following provisions:

(a) Inspection shall be carried out and certificates issued only by or under the authority of technically qualified and duly authorized officers and in such circumstances and with such knowledge and information available to those officers that the authorities of importing countries may accept such certificates with confidence as dependable documents.

(b) Each certificate covering material intended for planting or propagation shall be as worded in the Annex to this Convention and shall include such additional declarations as may be required by the importing country. The model certificate may also be used for other plants or plant products where appropriate and not inconsistent with the requirements of the importing country.

(c) The certificates shall bear no alterations or erasures.

2. Each contracting Government undertakes not to require consignments of plants intended for planting or propagation imported into its territories to be accompanied by phytosanitary certificates inconsistent with the model set out in the Annex to this Convention.

#### ARTICLE VI—REQUIREMENTS IN RELATION TO IMPORTS

1. With the aim of preventing the introduction of diseases and pests of plants into their territories, contracting

Governments shall have full authority to regulate the entry of plants and plant products, and to this end, may:

(a) prescribe restrictions or requirements concerning the importation of plants or plant products;

(b) prohibit the importation of particular plants or plant products, or of particular consignments of plants or plant products;

(c) inspect or detain particular consignments of plants or plant products;

(d) treat, destroy or refuse entry to particular consignments of plants or plant products, or require such consignments to be treated or destroyed.

2. In order to minimize interference with international trade, each contracting Government undertakes to carry out the provisions referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article in conformity with the following:

(a) Contracting Governments shall not, under their plant protection legislation, take any of the measures specified in paragraph 1 of this Article unless such measures are made necessary by phytosanitary considerations.

(b) If a contracting Government prescribes any restrictions or requirements concerning the importation of plants and plant products into its territories, it shall publish the restrictions or requirements and communicate them immediately to the plant protection services of other contracting Governments and to Fao.

(c) If a contracting Government prohibits, under the provisions of its plant protection legislation, the importation of any plants or plant products, it shall publish its decision with reasons and shall immediately inform the plant protection services of other contracting Governments and Fao.

(d) If a contracting Government requires consignments of particular plants or plant products to be imported only through specified points of entry, such points shall be so selected as not unnecessarily to impede international commerce. The contracting Government shall publish a list of such points of entry and communicate it to the plant protection services of other contracting Governments and to Fao. Such restrictions on points of entry shall not be made unless the plants or plant products concerned are required to be accompanied by phytosanitary certificates or to be submitted to inspection or treatment.

(e) Any inspection by the plant protection service of a contracting Government of consignments of plants offered for importation shall take place as promptly as possible with due regard to the perishability of the plants concerned. If any consignment is found not to conform to the requirements of the plant protection legislation of the importing country, the plant protection service of the exporting country shall be informed. If the consignment is destroyed, in whole or in part, an official report shall be forwarded immediately to the plant protection service of the exporting country.

(f) Contracting Governments shall make provisions which, without endangering their own plant production, will reduce to a minimum the number of cases in which a phytosanitary certificate is required on the entry of plants or plant products not intended for planting, such as cereals, fruits, vegetables and cut flowers.

(g) Contracting Governments may make provision for the importation for purposes of scientific research of

plants and plant products and of specimens of plant pests and disease-causing organisms under conditions affording ample precaution against the risk of spreading plant diseases and pests.

3. The measures specified in this Article shall not be applied to goods in transit throughout the territories of contracting Governments unless such measures are necessary for the protection of their own plants.

#### ARTICLE VII—INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

The contracting Governments shall co-operate with one another to the fullest practicable extent in achieving the aims of this Convention, in particular as follows:

(a) Each contracting Government agrees to co-operate with Fao in the establishment of a world reporting service on plant diseases and pests, making full use of the facilities and services of existing organizations for this purpose, and, when this is established, to furnish to Fao periodically the following information:

(i) reports on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of economically important pests and diseases of plants and plant products which may be of immediate or potential danger;

(ii) information on means found to be effective in controlling the pests and diseases of plants and plant products.

(b) Each contracting Government shall, as far as is practicable, participate in any special campaigns for combating particular destructive pests or diseases which may seriously threaten crop production and need international action to meet the emergencies.

#### ARTICLE VIII—REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION

1. The contracting Governments undertake to co-operate with one another in establishing regional plant protection organizations in appropriate areas.

2. The regional plant protection organizations shall function as the co-ordinating bodies in the areas covered and shall participate in various activities to achieve the objectives of this Convention.

#### ARTICLE IX—SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

1. If there is any dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, or if a contracting Government considers that any action by another contracting Government is in conflict with the obligations of the latter under Articles V and VI of this Convention, especially regarding the basis of prohibiting or restricting the imports of plants or plant products coming from its territories, the Government or Governments concerned may request the Director-General of Fao to appoint a committee to consider the question in dispute.

2. The Director-General of Fao shall thereupon, after consultation with the Governments concerned, appoint a committee of experts which shall include representatives of those Governments. This committee shall consider the question in dispute, taking into account all documents and other forms of evidence submitted by the Governments concerned. This committee shall submit a report to the Director-General of Fao who shall transmit it to the Governments concerned, and to other contracting Governments.

3. The contracting Governments agree that the recommendations of such a committee, while not binding in character, will become the basis for renewed consideration by the Governments concerned of the matter out of which the disagreement arose.

4. The Governments concerned shall share equally the expenses of the experts.

#### ARTICLE X—SUBSTITUTION OF PRIOR AGREEMENTS

This Convention shall terminate and replace, between contracting Governments, the International Convention respecting measures to be taken against the *Phylloxera vastatrix* of 3 November 1881, the additional Convention signed at Berne on 15 April 1889 and the International Convention for the Protection of Plants signed at Rome on 16 April 1929.

#### ARTICLE XI—TERRITORIAL APPLICATION

1. Any Government may at the time of ratification or adherence or at any time thereafter communicate to the Director-General of FAO a declaration that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible, and this Convention shall be applicable to all territories specified in the declaration as from the thirtieth day after the receipt of the declaration by the Director-General.

2. Any Government which has communicated to the Director-General of FAO a declaration in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article may at any time communicate a further declaration modifying the scope of any former declaration or terminating the application of the provisions of the present Convention in respect of any territory. Such modification or termination shall take effect as from the thirtieth day after the receipt of the declaration by the Director-General.

3. The Director-General of FAO shall inform all signatory and adhering Governments of any declaration received under this Article.

#### ARTICLE XII—RATIFICATION AND ADHERENCE

1. This Convention shall be open for signature by all Governments until 1 May 1952 and shall be ratified at the earliest possible date. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Director-General of FAO, who shall give notice of the date of deposit to each of the signatory Governments.

2. As soon as this Convention has come into force in accordance with Article XIV, it shall be open for adherence by non-signatory Governments. Adherence shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of adherence with the Director-General of FAO, who shall notify all signatory and adhering Governments.

#### ARTICLE XIII—AMENDMENT

1. Any proposal by a contracting Government for the amendment of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director-General of FAO.

2. Any proposed amendment of this Convention received by the Director-General of FAO from a contracting Government shall be presented to a regular or special session of the Conference of FAO for approval and, if the amendment involves important technical changes or im-

poses additional obligations on the contracting Governments, it shall be considered by an advisory committee of specialists convened by FAO prior to the Conference.

3. Notice of any proposed amendment of this Convention shall be transmitted to the contracting Governments by the Director-General of FAO not later than the time when the agenda of the session of the Conference at which the matter is to be considered is dispatched.

4. Any such proposed amendment of this Convention shall require the approval of the Conference of FAO and shall come into force as from the thirtieth day after acceptance by two-thirds of the contracting Governments. Amendments involving new obligations for contracting Governments, however, shall come into force in respect of each contracting Government only on acceptance by it and as from the thirtieth day after such acceptance.

5. The instruments of acceptance of amendments involving new obligations shall be deposited with the Director-General of FAO, who shall inform all contracting Governments of the receipt of acceptances and the entry into force of amendments.

#### ARTICLE XIV—ENTRY INTO FORCE

As soon as this Convention has been ratified by three signatory Governments it shall come into force between them. It shall come into force for each Government ratifying or adhering thereafter from the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification or adherence.

#### ARTICLE XV—DENUNCIATION

1. Any contracting Government may at any time give notice of denunciation of this Convention by notification addressed to the Director-General of FAO. The Director-General shall at once inform all signatory and adhering Governments.

2. Denunciation shall take effect one year from the date of receipt of the notification by the Director-General of FAO.

### Annex

#### MODEL PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATE

PLANT PROTECTION SERVICE OF..... No.....

This is to certify  
that the plants, parts of plants or plant products described below or representative samples of them were thoroughly examined on (date) .....  
by (name) ..... an authorized officer of the (service) .....  
and were found to the best of his knowledge to be substantially free from injurious diseases and pests; and that the consignment is believed to conform with the current phytosanitary regulations of the importing country both as stated in the additional declaration hereon and otherwise.

Fumigation or disinfection treatment (if required by importing country):

Date .....

Duration of exposure .....

Treatment -----  
Chemical and concentration-----

Additional declaration

----- 19--  
-----  
(Signature)  
-----  
(Rank)

(Stamp of the Service)

DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSIGNMENT

Name and address of exporter: -----  
Name and address of consignee: -----  
Number and description of packages: -----  
Distinguishing marks: -----  
Origin (if required by importing country): -----  
Means of conveyance: -----  
Point of entry: -----  
Quantity and name of produce: -----  
Botanical name (if required by importing country): -----

*DONE at Rome, Italy, on the sixth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one, in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity. This document shall be deposited in the archives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Certified copies shall be transmitted by the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization to each signatory and adhering Government.*

*IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized to that effect, have signed this Convention on behalf of their respective Governments on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.*

For Austria:  
R PHILLIP 6th of December 1951  
For the Kingdom of Belgium:  
A VAN HOUTTE 6 décembre 1951  
ad referendum  
For Brazil:  
JOSUE DE CASTRO 6 de décembre 1951  
ad ref.

For Canada:  
H. BARTON Dec. 6, 1951  
ad ref.

For Ceylon:  
G. C. S. COREA 7th December 1951

For Egypt:  
On account of the fact that the Royal Egyptian Government does not acknowledge and has not up till now acknowledged the existence of Israel, my signature to this Convention does not bind my Government by any means to Israel and has been allowed with all rights reserved in this connection.  
MOHAMED ALI EL KELANY 6.12.51  
ad ref.

For France:  
ANDRE MAYER 6 décembre 1951  
ad referendum

For India:  
J. N. KHOSLA 30/4/52

For the United States of Indonesia:  
SUBYO-DI-PURO December 6, 1951

For Ireland:  
THOMAS WALSH 6th December 1951  
ad ref.

For Israel:  
D MOSHE ISHAY 6.12.51

For Japan:  
R. YAMAZOE 6.12.51  
ad ref.

For Lebanon:

For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:  
BRUCK 16.1.52  
ad ref.

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:  
S. L. LOUWES 6.12.51  
ad ref.

For New Zealand:  
C. S. M. HOPKIRK 6.12.51

For Pakistan:

For the Republic of the Philippines:  
J S CAMUS 12/6/51  
subject to confirmation

For Portugal:  
ANTONIO PEREIRA DE SOUSA DA CAMARA 6 Dec. 51

For Spain:  
CARLOS REIN 10 décembre 51

For Switzerland:  
L MAIBE 6 déc. 1951

For Thailand:  
PHRA CHUANG KASHETRA Dec. 6, '51

For the Union of South Africa:  
S. J. DE SWARDT 6th Dec. 1951

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:  
CARRINGTON 6.12.51  
ad ref.

For the United States of America:  
P. V. CARDON 6:12 '51  
ad ref.

For Viet-Nam:

For Yugoslavia:  
DALIBOR SOLDATIC 6 Dec. 51  
ad ref.

For Cuba:  
CARLOS MARTINEZ 6 de decembre de 1951  
ad ref.

For Denmark:  
A P JACOBSEN 6 Dec. 1951  
ad ref.

For El Salvador:  
ROD B. SCHONENBERG 6 Dec. 1951  
ad ref.

For Sweden:  
JOHAN BECK-FRIIS 11 Dec. 1951

For Italy:  
AMINTORE FANFANI 2 fevrier 1952  
ad ref.



For Ecuador: R JACOME	12 marzo 1952 ad referendum
For Chile: C. CAMPO R.	3 abril 1952
For Guatemala: F COSENZA G	23 abril 1952 ad referendum
For Costa Rica: TEODORO B CASTRO	28 abril 1952 ad referendum
For Colombia: EDU ZULETA ANGEL <i>Ambassador of Colombia</i>	29 abril de 1952
For the Federal Republic of Germany: CLEMENS BRENTANO <i>Ambassador of Germany</i>	30 avril 52 ad referendum
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia: C. V. KELLWAY	30th April 1952
For Uruguay: C GIAMBRUNO	30 de abril de 1952 ad referendum

I hereby certify that this text is a true copy of the International Plant Protection Convention as signed in Rome by the representatives of 37 governments between December 6, 1951 and 1 May 1952.

NORRIS E. DODD

*Director-General of the Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United Nations.*

## Current Treaty Actions

### MULTILATERAL

#### Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

*Accession deposited:* Turkey, January 17, 1956.

Protocol providing for accession to the convention on road traffic by occupied countries or territories. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. TIAS 2487.

*Accession deposited:* Turkey, January 17, 1956.

#### International Court of Justice

Statute of the International Court of Justice (59 Stat. 1055).

*Declaration recognizing compulsory jurisdiction deposited:* Portugal, December 19, 1955 (with a reservation); India, January 9, 1956.<sup>1</sup>

#### North Atlantic Ice Patrol

Agreement regarding financial support of the North Atlantic Ice Patrol. Opened for signature at Washington January 4, 1956.<sup>2</sup>

*Signatures:* United Kingdom, February 9, 1956.

<sup>1</sup> Termination deposited Jan. 9, 1956, of Declaration of Feb. 28, 1940, accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force.

### BILATERAL

#### Burma

Agricultural commodities agreement. Signed at Rangoon February 8, 1956. Entered into force February 8, 1956.

#### India

Air transport agreement and exchange of notes. Signed at New Delhi February 3, 1956. Entered into force February 3, 1956.

#### Israel

Agreement modifying the agricultural commodities agreement of November 10, 1955 (TIAS 3429) to permit sales for Israel pounds of an additional 1,000 metric tons of butter. Exchange of notes at Washington January 31, 1956. Entered into force February 1, 1956.

#### Spain

Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of April 20, 1955, as amended (TIAS 3246, 3455), by providing for the sale of soybean oil and cottonseed oil to Spain. Signed at Madrid January 21, 1956. Entered into force January 21, 1956.

#### Yugoslavia

Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of January 5, 1955, as amended (TIAS 3167, 3252, 3253, 3446), by providing for the sale of wheat, cotton, and lard to Yugoslavia. Signed at Belgrade January 19, 1956. Entered into force January 19, 1956.

Agreement providing for certain economic assistance on a loan basis pursuant to section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 403). Effected by exchange of notes at Belgrade January 19, 1956. Entered into force January 19, 1956.

## Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Korea Comes Into Force

On February 3 the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State (press release 61) announced that a cooperative agreement between the United States and the Republic of Korea covering research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was signed on that day at the Department of State. Ambassador You Chan Yang signed the agreement for Korea. The Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Walter S. Robertson, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Lewis Strauss, signed for the United States.

This agreement was initialed by representatives of the two Governments July 1, 1955. Under terms of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act, certain procedural steps must be taken by executive and legislative branches of the United States Government before agreements of this type may come into force. These steps have now been taken; with the signing today, the agreement now becomes effective for both countries.

## PUBLICATIONS

### Recent Releases

*For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.*

**Germany—Boundary Changes Between United States and Soviet Zones of Occupation.** TIAS 3081. Pub. 5972. 4 pp., map. 20¢.

Agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—Signed at Wanfried, Saxony, Germany, September 17, 1945. Entered into force September 17, 1945.

**Defense—Offshore Procurement Program.** TIAS 3083. Pub. 5694. 58 pp. 20¢.

Agreement between the United States and Italy. Exchange of notes—Signed at Rome March 31, 1954. Entered into force March 31, 1954.

**Defense—Use of Facilities in the Azores.** TIAS 3087. Pub. 5716. 8 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Portugal—Signed at Lisbon September 6, 1951. Entered into force September 6, 1951.

**Technical Cooperation—Program of Housing.** TIAS 3090. Pub. 5709. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Colombia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Bogotá June 24 and 30, 1954. Entered into force June 30, 1954.

**Technical Cooperation—Program of Agriculture.** TIAS 3091. Pub. 5710. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Mexico. Exchange of notes—Signed at México June 17, 1954. Entered into force June 17, 1954.

**Defense—Offshore Procurement Program.** TIAS 3094. Pub. 5717. 30 pp. 15¢.

Agreement between the United States and Spain. Exchange of notes—Signed at San Sebastián July 30, 1954. Entered into force July 30, 1954. And amending agreement. Exchange of notes—Signed at Madrid October 26, 1954. Entered into force October 26, 1954.

**Agriculture—Cooperative Program in Peru.** TIAS 3095. Pub. 5718. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Peru—Providing for termination of agreement of April 1 and 9, 1952, as modified and extended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Lima April 27 and May 11, 1954. Entered into force May 11, 1954.

**Defense—Use of Five Islands for Recreational Purposes.** TIAS 3096. Pub. 5719. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Trinidad and Tobago. Exchange of letters—Signed at Port-of-Spain November 19, 1953, and July 19, 1954. Entered into force July 19, 1954.

**Mutual Defense Assistance—Facilities Assistance Program.** TIAS 3098. Pub. 5721. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Spain. Exchange of notes—Signed at Madrid April 9, May 11 and May 19, 1954. Entered into force May 19, 1954.

**Free Territory of Trieste—Administration of Zones A and B by Italian and Yugoslav Governments.** TIAS 3099. Pub. 5723. 13 pp., map. 25¢.

Understanding, with annexes, between the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Yugoslavia—Dated at London October 5, 1954. Entered into force October 5, 1954. And related notes—Signed at London October 5, 1954.

**Trade-Marks.** TIAS 3100. Pub. 5725. 3 pp. 5¢.

Declaration between the United States and Viet-Nam. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington November 3, 1953, and October 25, 1954. Entered into force October 25, 1954. And note—Signed November 22, 1954.

**Mutual Defense Assistance—Facilities Assistance Program.** TIAS 3102. Pub. 5736. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Belgium. Exchange of notes—Signed at Brussels November 23, 1954. Entered into force November 23, 1954. And agreed minute.

**Economic Aid to Yugoslavia.** TIAS 3103. Pub. 5737. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Belgrade January 4 and 5, 1954. Entered into force January 5, 1954; operative retroactively July 1, 1953.

**Technical Cooperation Civil Aviation Mission to Costa Rica.** TIAS 3104. Pub. 5755. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Costa Rica. Exchange of notes—Signed at San José August 7 and September 11, 1951. Entered into force September 11, 1951.

**Military Mission to Costa Rica.** TIAS 3109. Pub. 5744. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Costa Rica—Extending agreement of December 10, 1945, as amended and extended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington July 2 and September 18, 1953. Entered into force September 18, 1953.

**Hospitals and Medical Care for Philippine Veterans.** TIAS 3111. Pub. 5746. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines—Modifying agreement of June 7, 1949. Exchange of notes—Signed at Manila October 6, 1954. Entered into force October 6, 1954.

**Copyright.** TIAS 3114. Pub. 5758. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and India. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington October 21, 1954. Entered into force October 21, 1954.

**Relief Supplies and Equipment—Duty-Free Entry and Exemption From Internal Taxation.** TIAS 3115. Pub. 5759. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Viet-Nam. Exchange of notes—Dated at Saigon August 20 and 26, 1954. Entered into force August 26, 1954.

**Air Transport Services.** TIAS 3117. Pub. 5763. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Venezuela—Amending annex to agreement of August 14, 1953. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington December 30, 1954. Entered into force December 30, 1954.

**Agriculture**

- Agricultural Agreement With Burma . . . . . 308  
 International Plant Protection Convention Transmitted to Senate (Eisenhower, Dulles, text of convention) . . . . . 311  
 Policies of the Department of State on Disposal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities (Armstrong) . . . . . 301  
 P.L. 480 Agreement With Austria . . . . . 308

**American Republics. Territorial Waters and Related Matters (text of report) . . . . . 296****Asia. U.S. Chiefs of Mission in Asia To Meet at Tokyo . . . . . 278****Atomic Energy**

- AEC Regulation Concerning Foreign Atomic Energy Activity . . . . . 309  
 Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Korea . . . . . 317  
 Austria. P.L. 480 Agreement With Austria . . . . . 308

**Bolivia. \$20 Million Development Aid for Bolivia . . . . . 300****Brazil. Export-Import Bank Loan to Brazilian Railway . . . . . 299****Burma. Agricultural Agreement With Burma . . . . . 308****Chile. Letters of Credence (Rodriguez) . . . . . 295****China, Communist. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Congress, The****International Plant Protection Convention Transmitted to Senate (Eisenhower, Dulles, text of convention) . . . . . 311****Recommended Changes in Immigration Legislation (Eisenhower) . . . . . 275****United States Policy in the Middle East (Dulles, Congressional letter) . . . . . 285****Economic Affairs****Export-Import Bank Loan to Brazilian Railway . . . . . 299****Tariff Concessions to Sweden (announcement, Eisenhower letter) . . . . . 289****Territorial Waters and Related Matters (text of report) . . . . . 296****World Bank Reports \$13.7 Million Net Income for 6-Month Period . . . . . 300****Europe****Exchange of Views With President of Coal and Steel Authority . . . . . 288****Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Foreign Service. U.S. Chiefs of Mission in Asia To Meet at Tokyo . . . . . 278****France. Tripartite Meeting on Situation in Middle East . . . . . 286****Germany****Protest on Para-Military Units in East Berlin (text of note) . . . . . 293****The Present Situation in Germany (Hoover) . . . . . 290****Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Health, Education, and Welfare. ICA Gives Gamma Globulin To Combat Epidemic in India . . . . . 288****Hungary. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Immigration and Naturalization. Recommended Changes in Immigration Legislation (Eisenhower) . . . . . 275****India. ICA Gives Gamma Globulin To Combat Epidemic in India . . . . . 288****International Law****Territorial Waters and Related Matters (text of report) . . . . . 296****Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****International Organizations and Meetings. Territorial Waters and Related Matters (text of report) . . . . . 296****Ireland. Visit of Prime Minister of Ireland . . . . . 290****Korea. Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Korea . . . . . 317****Mutual Security****ICA Gives Gamma Globulin To Combat Epidemic in India . . . . . 288****\$20 Million Development Aid for Bolivia . . . . . 300****Near East****Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Tripartite Meeting on Situation in Middle East . . . . . 286****United States Policy in the Middle East (Dulles, Congressional letter) . . . . . 285****Pakistan. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****Presidential Documents****International Plant Protection Convention Transmitted to Senate (Eisenhower, Dulles, text of convention) . . . . . 311****Recommended Changes in Immigration Legislation (Eisenhower) . . . . . 275****Tariff Concessions to Sweden (announcement, Eisenhower letter) . . . . . 289****Publications. Recent Releases . . . . . 318****Science. Correspondence With U.S.S.R. Concerning Weather Balloons . . . . . 293****Sweden. Tariff Concessions to Sweden (announcement, Eisenhower letter) . . . . . 289****Treaty Information****Agricultural Agreement With Burma . . . . . 308****Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Korea . . . . . 317****Current Actions****International Plant Protection Convention Transmitted to Senate (Eisenhower, Dulles, text of convention) . . . . . 311****P.L. 480 Agreement With Austria . . . . . 308****U.S.S.R.****Correspondence With U.S.S.R. Concerning Weather Balloons (text of notes) . . . . . 293****Protest on Para-Military Units in East Berlin (text of note) . . . . . 293****Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference . . . . . 279****United Kingdom. Tripartite Meeting on Situation in Middle East . . . . . 286****United Nations****Current U.N. Documents . . . . . 310****U.S. Contributes \$6 Million to U.N. Technical Assistance . . . . . 310****Name Index****Armstrong, Willis C. . . . . 301****Conant, James B. . . . . 293****Costello, John A. . . . . 290****Dulles, Secretary . . . . . 279, 285, 311****Eisenhower, President . . . . . 275, 289, 311****Hoover, Herbert, Jr. . . . . 290****Mayer, René . . . . . 288****Rodriguez Altamirano, Mario . . . . . 295****Check List of Department of State Press Releases: February 6-12**

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press release issued prior to February 6 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 61 of February 3.

No.	Date	Subject
64	2/6	Tariff concessions to Sweden.
65	2/6	Dulles: letter on Middle East policy.
66	2/7	Armstrong: disposal of agricultural surpluses.
67	2/7	Surplus commodities agreement with Austria.
68	2/7	Dulles: news conference transcript.
69	2/8	Conference of Far East chiefs of mission.
70	2/8	Agricultural commodities agreement with Burma.
*71	2/8	Educational exchange.
72	2/8	Note to U.S.S.R. on weather balloons.
73	2/8	Tripartite meeting on Middle East.
*74	2/9	Educational exchange.
75	2/9	Communique on Mayer visit.
76	2/10	Hoover: "The Present Situation in Germany."
77	2/10	Protest on East Berlin military units.

\*Not printed.



the  
Department  
of  
State

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(GPO)

## Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America

Publication 6131

25 cents

Once again one of the vast land masses of the world has caught fire and is growing and developing at a rate that is sure to change completely its relationship to the rest of the world. The big news in our day is that Latin America's time has come. The vast growth in its population, the rise in its standard of living, the development of natural resources, industry, and commerce are sure to mean a commensurate increase in international prestige and influence.

What is the attitude of the United States toward this sudden upsurge in Latin America? *Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America* tells the story of the growth and changes that are taking place in the other members of the American family of states and the attitude of the United States toward this wholesome progress. The 50-page illustrated booklet contains the following sections:

- I. Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America
- II. Our Government's Contribution to the Economic Development of Latin America
- III. The Role of Private Enterprise in the Economic Development of Latin America
- IV. The Importance of Trade in Inter-American Relations
- V. Political, Cultural, and Military Aspects of the Inter-American System.

Copies of *Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America* are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for 25 cents.

### Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....  
(cash, check, or  
money order).

Please send me ----- copies of *Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy in Latin America*.

Name: -----

Street Address: -----

City, Zone, and State: -----



